00111580

Processed at
The Preservation & conservation
Laboratory of
The Asiatic Society of Bombay
Date Jan-02

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016

2796 / 22 cm A XXXVI, 520p

LOGICAL ANALYSIS

OF THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS,

BY CHARLES FERME,

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN BY WILLIAM SKAE, A.M.;

AND 111580

A COMMENTARY ON THE SAME EPISTLE

BY ANDREW MELVILLE,

IN THE ORIGINAL LATIN.

EDITED, WITH A LIFE OF FERME,

BY WILLIAM LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D.,

F.C.A. SCOT.

EDINBURGH:

PRINTED FOR THE WODROW SOCIETY.

MDCCCL.

1850

221.1
Fer/Log
111580

00111580

PRINTED BY ALEX. WALKER, 6, JAMES'S COURT, EDINBURGH.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

SEVERAL years ago I happened, in looking over the contents o
an old book-stall at Newcastle, to lay my hands on a little,
conditioned volume, the title-page of which bore, as the auth
a name with which at the time I was not acquainted. That
page, however, promised attractively for the book, intimatin
it professed to furnish a Logical Analysis of the Apostle
Epistle to the Romans—a profession which no man who
endeavoured to master the train of reasoning pursu
Apostle, in that most logical of all his writings, could
indifference. I perceived, also, that the work was
authorship—that it belonged to the age immediate
the era of the Reformation, and that it had been is
high sanction of John Adamson, Principal of th
Edinburgh, the friend of Andrew Melville, and on
of theologians, to whose love of literature, liber
truth, Scotland owes so much. I accordingly
and having, as soon as I could, commenced
speedily discovered that I had secured a pri
cious, exact and perspicuous a commentar
Romans I had not before had the good fo

gratification I felt, however, in possessing such a book, succeeded an emotion of regret that it should be so little known to biblical students, and so utterly inaccessible to any but a very few; and this begat in me a desire, should opportunity offer, of sending it forth anew, either in the original or in a translation.

I had not been long on the Council of the Wodrow Society till I brought the book under the notice of that body, and urged the desirableness of their issuing a translation of it as part of their eries. After some delay, my wishes were acceded to, and the ity of procuring a translation and editing it was devolved upon

Unable to find time to execute the translation myself, I was nate in securing the services of a gentleman in whose exact rship and general fitness for the task I had perfect confidence. nciples which have guided Mr Skae in making his transla- e the reader to gather from his own statement; I have , that having carefully revised every sheet as it passed press, I issue the translation unaltered, as it proceeded e, with the utmost confidence that it will meet the all competent judges.

s of the work itself I will not enlarge. I believe to deserve all I have said of it, and will be hailed ripture as a valuable addition to their helps for eaning and connection of the Apostle's words in art of his writings to which it is devoted. I ds an accordance in the eulogy pronounced d Adamson, when he calls it "eruditionis, ü plenam."

serted in this volume, I have endeavoured

to put together all the scattered notices, bearing upon his history, I could find. With this object in view, I thought it better to write a continuous narrative of my own than to translate the short sketch prefixed by Adamson to his edition of the Analysis, and thus be compelled to introduce any additions I might have to make to it in the form either of interpolations or of notes. To that sketch, however, I have been principally indebted for the few facts I have been able to gather concerning Ferme. I have also to express my acknowledgments to Mr Laing for some valuable suggestions communicated as the sheets were passing through the press.

As the Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans is not long enough to fill an entire volume of the size usually issued by the Wodrow Society, it became necessary to find some other work which might with propriety be issued along with it. At first I thought of some of the exegetical writings of John Cameron, sometime Professor at Saumur, but a native of Scotland, and whose name is well known to biblical students and readers of ecclesiastical history. But this idea was at once relinquished when I became acquainted with the fact that the Council of the Wodrow Society had had before them the proposal of issuing a hitherto unpublished commentary of Andrew Melville on the Epistle to the Romans. This proposal I seconded with all my might; believing that, to Scotsmen especially, nothing which had proceeded from the pen of Andrew Melville could be otherwise than interesting. The Council having, after careful deliberation, consented to print this work, I had the high satisfaction of being permitted to carry it through the press in conjunction with the Commentary of Ferme.

The MS. from which this work of Melville is printed is the pro-

perty of David Laing, Esq., to whose courtesy in placing it in the hands of the Council, the members of the Wodrow Society are indebted for its publication, as they are for many other invaluable services rendered to the Society by that gentleman. It is not in the handwriting of Melville himself, but in that of Daniel Demetrius, a native of Frankenthal, a town in the lower Palatinate, four leagues to the west of Heidelberg, one of Melville's students at St Andrews,* and who asserts that he transcribed it from Melville's own copy. It consists of one hundred leaves in small quarto.

As this work has never before been published, it was deemed proper to issue it in the original, that those interested in Melville might enjoy the satisfaction of perusing his *ipsissima verba*. In judging of the work, the reader will not fail to bear in mind that it was not purposed for the press by the author, and therefore must not be taken as affording a specimen of Melville's full powers as an expositor of Scripture. It seems, in fact, to have been prepared only as a book of notes, to be used by him in his class in prelecting upon the Epistle to the Romans. Notwithstanding, however, all the disadvantages under which it thus labours, I believe it will be welcomed by the Members of the Wodrow Society, not only as a valuable relic of an illustrious and venerable man, but for its intrinsic merits, as expository of the words of the Apostle.

The editing of this work has been, to myself and to the printer,

* See M'Crie's *Life of Melville*, vol. ii., p. 492. May not this individual have been some relation of Emmanuel van Metern or Demetrius, the historian? He was a native of Antwerp, but having zealously embraced the doctrines of the Reformers, he had to flee to this country, where he resided until his death in 1612. He was a voluminous writer.—See *Biographie Universelle sub vocc. Demetrius* and *Metern*. There is a portrait of him in the Bibliotheca Belgica, with a couple of epitaphs, one written by the celebrated Ortelius, who was his kinsman, the other inscribed on a monument raised to his memory by his widow.

a task of no small toil. The MS. though beautifully executed, was written, the transcriber tells us, in the space of eight days, and is consequently full of contractions which have occasionally severely exercised the patience and ingenuity both of compositor and of corrector. The punctuation also had been but little attended to, and, in consequence of this, the author's meaning was often rendered obscure or uncertain. In one or two instances errors have evidently been committed by the transcriber or by the author, as the construction is faulty, or the latinity inadmissible; but these are rare. Amid such a multitude of corrections as I have had to make on every sheet, I cannot hope to have so perfectly fulfilled my editorial functions as to issue an immaculate edition; but I trust such errors as may have been allowed to remain will be found to be trivial and not such as at all to impede the reader. I can certify for myself and the printer, that no pains have been spared by us to render the work as correct as possible; and I hope if any blemishes are found by the critical reader, he will remember the difficulties with which we have had to contend, and not be offended with a few blots, "quas [*non*] incuria fudit, [*sed*] humana parum cavit natura." I trust also that the Members of the Wodrow Society will accept of the apology which the manifold impediments of such an undertaking furnish for the delay which has occurred in the issuing of this volume.

W. L. A.

Pinkiemuir,
1st *March* 1850.

LIFE OF FERME.

LIFE OF FERME.

Of Charles Ferme or Fairholm, * the author of the Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, of which a translation is now offered to the public, little is known beyond a few facts. For these we are principally indebted to two of his pupils,—Principal Adamson, who has prefixed a short notice of him to the original edition of this work, published in 1651, and Calderwood, who repeatedly names him in his history.

From Adamson's notice, we gather that Ferme was a native of Edinburgh, and that he received his education there. To whom he was indebted for laying the foundation of his attainments we are not informed; Crawford says,† that he was of obscure parentage, and was bred up in the family of Mr Alexander Guthrie.

* Fairholm appears to have been his proper name. Calderwood always writes it Farholm, and Row says expressly, (*Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland*, p. 421, Wodr. Soc. edit.,) "Mr Charles Farholme, (*alias* Ferme *contracte.*)" Adamson, however, always calls him Fermæus, and it is by the contracted form that he seems to have been usually spoken of and to by his contemporaries. In the college books his name seems to be written Pharm. On a copy of the Scholia of Didymus on Homer (Argent. 1539) which seems to have belonged to him, the name appears thus, "Mr Carolus Pharum," with the motto, "Christus mihi vita." In the Records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh, from 1593 to 1598, his name is usually written Pharum, but sometimes Ferum, Ferme; and in a letter, dated 21st February 1605, he signs his name "Chairlis Ferm." I owe this piece of information to the kindness of Mr Laing.

† *History of the University of Edinburgh*, p. 33.

After he had acquired a knowledge of grammar and the Latin authors, he was, apparently in the year 1584, being of "good age,"* transferred to the University, then recently opened under the auspices of the never-to-be-forgotten Robert Rollock. Here he enjoyed the instructions of that distinguished promoter of learning in Scotland during the course of four years—the term prescribed by him as the curriculum of study preparatory to the taking of the degree of Master of Arts. Under Rollock's guidance Ferme studied, in addition to the Greek, the Dialectics of Ramus, (to which his preceptor attached the greatest value, as an instrument so admirably adapted to the study of logic, that no one, in his opinion, who was ignorant of it, could either excel in synthetical, or know anything of analytical reasoning); the rhetoric of Talaeus, the pupil and follower of Ramus; the Organon, Physics and Ethics of Aristotle; the treatise *De Sphaera Mundi*, of John Sacrobosco or Holybush; and a few other works in philosophy.† From these he was conducted to theology, where, besides the study of the Catechism of Ursinus, he listened to prelections on the *Loci Communes* of the Christian system, and to analytical expositions of some of the Epistles; he also acquired the rudiments of the Hebrew tongue. In 1587 Ferme had completed his academical course, and, along with forty-seven of his fellow-students, took his degree of M. A.; in the Laureation book his name stands second on the list. In the month of October following his laureation, he offered himself as a candidate for the office of Regent, but on this occasion without success; his fellow-student Philip

* Crawfurd, *History of the University of Edinburgh*, p. 33.

† See Bower's *History of the University of Edinburgh*, vol. i. c. iv.; *Life of Rollock* by Dr Gunn, prefixed to the Wodrow Society edition of his Select Works, p. 66.

Hislop, the fourth on the list, proving the successful competitor. For a season he devoted himself to the further prosecution of his theological studies and to a more complete acquisition of the Hebrew, still under the direction of Rollock, who, on the laureation of his first class, had been promoted to the Professorship of Divinity; but in the early part of the year 1589, he was chosen one of the Regents of the University, and commenced the duties of his office with a numerous class, which he conducted with credit through the ordinary curriculum.* In 1593 he entered with a new class, which he also conducted to its laureation, 30th July 1597; the number graduated was 35, including Robert Ker of Newbattle, afterwards Earl of Lothian. He had but just commenced his instructions to a third class when he was summoned to another sphere of labour at Fraserburgh.

Of Ferme as a teacher Principal Adamson says, "He taught his pupils not only erudition but piety, modesty and industry; and that not by word only but by his life, by his manners and example. Among his pupils," he adds, "were several who became men of piety, learning, and eloquence, and rendered excellent service to the Church of God. Of these may be mentioned that keen antagonist of the pseudo-bishops, David Calderwood, who, in his *Altare Damascenum*, styles himself, by an anagram, Edwardus Didoclavius, feeling it necessary to conceal his name, lest he should fall into the cruel hands of the bishops. Besides him may be named Robert Scot, who faithfully, and to the salvation of many,

* The number of students laureated August 12. 1593, was 19, besides John Earl of Gowrye, and two others, added separately, probably, (Mr Laing suggests) because they had not attended the four years' course.

discharged the functions of the ministry at Glasgow; William Craig, afterwards a distinguished Professor of Theology at Saumur; Oliver Colt, who, after being a Professor of Latin in the same University, devoted himself wholly to the study of theology, and afterwards became minister at Fulden, where he closed a life of many labours in peace; Edward Bryce, who both here and in Ireland brought many to Christ; and not a few besides, who have been famous men in the Church." To these may be added the name of Adamson himself, who was a student in the class which graduated in 1597, not the least worthy certainly of the band.

It would appear that, whilst engaged in his academical duties at Edinburgh, Ferme was also employed in occasionally preaching the gospel. In the records of the Presbytery of Edinburgh it is stated under the date of 12th September 1598, that at the "desyre of Patrik Cohren and Georg Heriot commisionars direct from ye session of ye kirk of the north-west quarter of Edr.," the Presbytery "tollerat Mr Charles Ferume to preach in the Kirk of that quarter, at sic tymes and necessary occasiones as he salbe imployit be said session."* From the records of the Presbytery of Haddington, also, it appears that he was at one time invited to be second minister of that town. †

In removing to Fraserburgh Ferme had in view the double office of Minister of the town and Principal of a University which had been recently founded there by Sir Alexander Fraser of Philorth. This gentleman, to whom the town was under great obligations for many important services, and from whom it takes its present name, having been formerly called Philorth, had obtained in

* Cited by Dr M'Crie, *Life of Melville*, vol. ii., p. 287. † Ap. eund.

1592 a charter from the Crown, in which full powers were given to him and to his heirs to erect and endow a college and university, to appoint, place, or remove officers of all kinds requisite for such an institution, and to make and enforce all statutes needful for its due order and working. The same immunities and privileges were secured to this projected institution as were enjoyed by the existing universities of the realm; and in 1597 the Parliament gave its approbation to the institution, highly commending the patriotic liberality of the founder, and confirming him in all the rights conferred on him by the royal charter.

Anxious to secure for his infant college a Principal of approved character and experience, Sir Alexander invited Ferme to the office, and, at the same time, as patron of the church of Fraserburgh, offered him the situation of minister of that parish. Ferme probably hesitated before accepting a post of so much responsibility and labour; it is certain that he declared to the General Assembly of the Church that he would not accept it without their command to do so. There seems also to have been some hesitation in issuing such a command, on the part of that venerable body when the matter came before them at their session of 21st March 1600, in consequence of a "supplicatione given in be the Presbytry of Deir;" but "having considered the necessity of the said worke, and how the said Laird of Phillorthe hes refusit to sustain ane pastor at the said kirk, unless he undertake both the saids charges," they at length resolved to "command and charge the said Mr Charles Ferme to undertake and awayte upon, alsweill the said kirk, as to be Principall of the Colledge of Fraserburgh."*

* *Bookes of the Universall Kirk of Scotland.* Peterkin's edition, p. 486.

In his new position Ferme was destined to enjoy little ease. The establishment of Episcopacy in 1600, led to keen controversies, in which Ferme seems to have taken no unwilling part. "The Bishops," says Adamson, "he denounced as plants which God had not planted, and as, therefore, to be extirpated; he accused them of violating the covenant, and held them guilty of perjury." The consequence was that he became a marked object of resentment to the Episcopal party, who afflicted him and interrupted his labours by every means in their power. He was a member of the General Assembly held at Aberdeen in 1605, and for his share in its proceedings was imprisoned in the castle of Doune.* Along with others he was summoned to appear before the Lords of the Privy Council at Edinburgh, the 24th of October of that year, to be convicted of having proceeded "verie contemptiouslie and seditiouslie," in having assembled themselves and acted as they had.† This summons the imprisoned ministers declined to obey; but, at the same time, under protest, and for the sake of clearing themselves of the crimes alleged against them, they sent to the Council an elaborate vindication of their conduct, both as to the holding of that Assembly and as to the business transacted during its sessions. The Council, disregarding their protest, asserted its competency to decide in such questions, and remitted the ministers to their several places of confinement. After remaining incarcerated in Doune castle for more than twelve months, Ferme was banished to some place of confinement in the

* Calderwood, vol. vi., p. 292. Calderwood says, Ferme was "wairded" in Stirling, p. 292; but a document printed at the time, and preserved by him, says it was at Doune; p. 445.

† Calderwood, vol. vi. p. 344.

Highlands, the name of which has not been ascertained.* Here he suffered the greatest severities, which he seems to have borne with much fortitude. "I have to this hour," he wrote to Mr Robert Bruce in 1608, "been relieved by the comfort of no creature; neither have I here to whom I may go. A thousand deaths hath my soul tasted of; but still the mercy and truth of the Lord hath recovered me. The Lord perfyte [accomplish] his own work in me." †

How long Ferme continued the victim of this cruel injustice is uncertain. In 1609 he was still in confinement; and, as Calderwood terms it, "put to his shifts."‡ Archibald Simson in his [unpublished] *Annales Ecclesiae Scotorum* says, that Ferme was confined "fere triennio." As he was sent to the Highlands in October 1606, if he was liberated in the fall of 1609, his banishment would be exactly for about three years. How far Simson is correct in this statement, however, may be doubted; all we know for certain is, that Ferme was restored, and continued at Fraserburgh till his death. §

Notwithstanding the interruptions and harassment to which he was thus exposed, he discharged the functions of his office with credit in his new sphere. "With what zeal he taught at Fraserburgh," says Adamson, "both publicly and privately, from house

* Calderwood simply mentions (vol. vi., p. 590), that the ministers "who were wairded in Stirline, Doune, Dunbartane, were to be confynned in barbarous parts, as the Lewes, the Iles, Kintyre, Ireland, Cathnesse." Further on (p. 702) he mentions that Mr Ferme "was confynned in the Hielands."

† Quoted by Calderwood, vol. vi., 702.

‡ Vol. vii., p. 21.

§ In the Assignation of Stipends for the year 1607, Mr Charles Ferme, as minister of Philorth, had for "his stipend the haill personage of Philorth, iijxxxiiij (74) lib. xvs. vjd. with the haill vicarage of Philorth, xij. lib. ijs iijd. In 1608, his name is omitted; and, (with the exception of the year 1614, not quite perfect), the books of Assignation, of a later date, are not preserved.

to house, is known to the whole north. Through his industry, and by the divine blessing, such a light blazed forth that even children could render an admirable account of their faith, and that not without some feeling of piety. . . . . A Tydeus in body he was a Hercules in spirit." The sword, however, proved too sharp for its scabbard, bruised and battered as the latter had been by ill usage on the part of others. Worn out with study, broken by incessant toil and frequent sufferings, he expired on the 24th of September 1617. His remains were buried in the old Church of Philorth.*

Adamson says, that he left behind him "various monuments of his genius," and specifies, besides the work of which a translation is contained in the present volume, another, entitled *Lectiones in Esterem;* both of which he recovered through the means of William Rires, "a learned youth, and minister of the word," as he styles him. The Logical Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans was written by Ferme during his residence at Fraserburgh, in consequence, Adamson tells us, of a request made to him by certain ministers and probationers. The manuscript lay for many years in the north, "as it were, buried with the author." After a lengthened search, Adamson at length procured it, and caused it to be printed at Edinburgh, where it was published in a small octavo volume in 1651. It was his intention to issue the Prelections on Esther very soon after the publication of the work on the Romans; but this he did not live to accomplish. I am not aware that any copy of this exists; the other productions of Ferme's pen have certainly perished.

* *Hist. of Scots Affairs*, by Gordon of Rothiemay, vol. i., p. xxxiii. note. Spalding Club edition. "The old Church of Philorth stood amongst the sands. It was dedicated to St Midan, a bishop in great favour with King Conran, about A.D. D.III." —Spalding Club *Collections from the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff*, p. 431.

After his decease, the College at Fraserburgh seems to have been suffered to fall into decay; eclipsed, in all probability, by the superior advantages of Marischal College, erected at the same time in the town of New Aberdeen.* At the beginning of the present century, there still stood at the west end of the town of Fraserburgh, an old quadrangular tower of three stories, which is said to have formed part of the building erected for the college, by Sir Alexander Fraser.†

Besides writing a sketch of his Life, Principal Adamson has recorded his feelings of respect and veneration for his former preceptor, in three Latin poems, which, along with one in English, also by himself, and two epigrams in Latin from the pens of H. Wallace,‡ and William Rires, he has inserted at the end of his

* M'Crie, *Life of Melville*, vol. ii., p. 287.

† Statistical Account of Scotland, vol. vi. p. 9. For the following information respecting the traces still extant of this relic of the olden time, as well as certain traditionary reminiscences of the college, I am indebted to the Rev. A. Gruar Forbes of Fraserburgh:—

"The old tower can scarcely be said to be still extant. It has been reduced to a heap, and is almost covered with soil and herbage. Last time I saw it there was a couple of goats feeding on the top of it.

"There is an old house of three stories between the site of the ruin and the town, which I have been repeatedly told was intended to form part of the college buildings, and to be used as dwelling-houses by the professors. This tenement is still entire, and is occupied by several families. On the front of it there are four oblong tablets with inscriptions,—

"Trust ye in God, for he is good,—His mercy is for ever,
And thank ye him for all ye have,—For he is only giver."

"Tradition does not seem to be correct, however, in declaring this to have formed a part of the projected college,—the date is too recent; over the door is an inscription of an anchor, with the letters, P. W.,—J. R.,—1718.—It is said that this stone over the door was put into the building at the time of its becoming private property. But, all things together, there does not appear to be evidence of the existence of any remains of the college but the heap of rubbish already referred to. There never having been a completion of the buildings, or an appointment of professors,—there is no tradition beyond what you know from the Statistical Account of Scotland."

‡ Probably the son of Hugh Wallace, Laird of Carnoll, so frequently mentioned by Calderwood.

Memoir. These, with the original of Adamson's sketch, his dedication of the Analysis to Sir Ludovick Stuart, and a few other poetical effusions called forth by the death of Ferme, and tending to shew the estimation in which he was held by his friends, it has been thought desirable to preserve in this volume. The poems have been taken from the MS. Annals of Simson already referred to.

CAROLI FERMÆI

Viri undiquaque Doctiſſimi,

ANALYSIS LOGICA

IN

EPISTOLAM APOSTOLI PAULI AD ROMANOS.

IN QUA

Omnia verba, ſententiæ & Phraſes difficiliores ex ſacris Scripturis exacte, ſolide & dilucide explicantur.

Ioan. 1. 39. *Venite et videte.*

Rom. 8. 23. *Suſpiramus adoptionem expectantes.*

EDINBVRGI,

Excudebant Hæredes *Georgii Andersoni*, Academiae *Edinburgenæ* Typographi, *Anno* Dom. 1651.

VIRO ORNATISSIMO,

D. LUDOVICO STUARTO, EQUITI,

ORATORI CAUSIDICOQUE JURISPRUDENTISSIMO, DISSERTISSIMOQUE

GRATIA ET PAX MULTIPLICETUR A DEO PATRE, ET

DOMINO N[illegible] IESU CHRISTO.

CAROLUS FERMAEUS, cum Fras[illegible]acro verbi ministerio fungeretur, rogatu quorundam ministrorum, [illegible]inisterii Candidatorum, scripsit Analysin Logicam in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos, eruditionis, pietatis et exacti judicii plenam. Qui quidem liber multos annos post obitum authoris jacuit in aquilone, quasi cum authore sepultus. Eum ego diu investigavi et tandem, per divinam providentiam, in manus meas devenit ejus exemplar: quod ego Praelo excudendum curavi typis non inelegantibus. Librum istum, ut tuo nomini inscribam, ut tibi dicem, dediceam, consecremque, multa sunt quae me argumenta moveant et permoveant. Primum, quia ut ego illi regenti meo, sic tu mihi regenti tuo in hac academia dilectissimus discipulus fuisti. Ideoque, ut ego patris, sic ille avi tibi loco fuerit. Deinde, quod tu, dum sub nostra ferula philosophiae et bonis artibus operam dares, non tantum tuae classi, sed et toti Academiae bono exemplo, et ornamento fueris. Tu enim modestia, gravitate, observantia et doctrina omnibus condiscipulis praeluxisti, et micuisti (ut ait Flaccus) velut inter Stellas Luna minores. Tertio, quia utilissimam tibi fore confido seriam hujus libri lectionem: nam ut Christum Dominum sincere amas, ita, ut magis, magisque ames, animabit, ad Christum propius adducet, unicamque docebit semitam ad remissionem peccatorum, aeternam justitiam, et vitam consequendam: quae est fides in Dominum Iesum Christum. Postremo, si nihil aliud, sane perpetua tua in me benevolentia et beneficentia me induceret ad hanc tui nominis nuncupationem. Quod reliquum est, gratiae Domini nostri Iesu

Christi te commendo, rogoque ut in filiam meam unicam ejusque maritum M. Andream Morum, MD., eorumque liberos, haereditario quasi jure, amorem tuum, me vita functo, transferas. Si quaeras quid agam, scias me, hoc anno nativitatis meae 75, animam paene agere: nam gravibus senectutis laboribus et doloribus attritus, post longam in undoso hoc vitae pelago jactationem, jam portum specto, expecto et expeto. Aeternum salve atque vale, mi Ludovice, animo meo charissime.

Tuus ut suus,

Io. Adamsonus,

Collec. Jac. R. *Primarius. M.*

LECTORI ERUDITO ET BENEVOLO.

Scias velim, lector benevole, de authore hujus libelli nonnihil. Author est M. Carolus Fermaeus, qui Edinburgi natus et educatus: ubi Grammaticam et Latinos Authores didicisset, D. Roberto Rolloco in disciplinam academiae traditus est: Rolloci ductu et auspiciis didicit grammaticam Graecam, authores Graecos, dialecticum P. Rami, (quam semper maxim, fecit D. Rollocus, utpote ad Analysin et Genesin instrumentum maxime idoneum, quo qui uti nesciunt, in synthesi forte aliquid praestare poterunt, in Analysi nihil) Rhetoricam Talaei, Aristotelis Logica, Physica, Ethica, et doctrinam de Sphaera Ioannis de Sacrobosco, Ursini Catechesin locos communes Theologicos, quarundum Sacrae Scripturae Epistolarum Analysin, et Hebraicae Linguae rudimenta. Absolvit quadrimum curriculum et Laurea donatus est, A.D. 1588. An. 1589, cum D. Rolloco se totum dedit studio Theologiae et Linguae Sanctae. Anno 1590, Rollocus praefecit eum numerosae classi, quae An. 1593, emissa est cum laurea. Hoc anno novam Classem aggressus, quam etiam ad metam perduxit. Auspicatus est tertiam Classem, sed vocatus ad Ministerium, Fraserburgum ex Academia vocatus est: docuit autem Discipulos cum eruditione pietatem, modestiam, et industriam: nec verbo tantum, sed et vita docuit, moribus et exemplo. Ex discipulis habuit plurimos, viros pios, doctos et disertos, qui egregiam operam navarunt Ecclesiae Dei. Ex iis erant David Caldervodius, acerrimus Pseudepiscoporum hostis, qui in Altari Damasceno se Edwardum Didoclavium per anagrammatismum appellavit: placuit enim viro bono nomen suum celare, quia mutuebat in Episcoporum, Orci satellitum, crudeles manus incidere: Robertus Scot, qui sacro ministerio Glasguae ad multorum salutem fideliter functus est: Guilielmus Craig, qui Salmurii Theologiam magna cum laude publice professus est. Olivarius Colt, vir disertus, qui postquam in hac Academia Latinos juxta et Graecos authoris publice professus esset, totum se studio theologiae dederat: ad sacrum deinde ministerium Fuldennum vocatus est, ubi, post multos exantlatos labores, vitam cum morte feliciter commutavit: Edwardus Bryce, qui et hic, et in Hibernia multos ad Christum adduxit. Hi erant ex Fermaei discipulis, et alii complures, viri in Ecclesia

et Rep. eximii. Quanto cum zelo docuerit Fraserburgi Carolus, et publice, et privatim per singulas domos, totus Boreas novit. Ex ejus industria, per benedictionem divinam, tanta lux affulserat, ut etiam pueruli fidei suae in Christum, non sine affectu pietatis, optime rationem redderent. Sed Episcopi, quia eos vocabat plantas a Deo non plantatas, ideoque exstirpandas, quia eos rupti foederis et perjurii reos arguebat, omnes intendebant nervos, ut eum exstirparent: saepe a grege semotus est, et carcere conclusus. Sed nullis minis, nullis terriculamentis a fideli officio absterreri poterat. Invicto et imperterrito animo hostium impetum excepit et fortiter sustinuit. Nam quamvis Tydeus corpore, animo tamen Hercules erat. Tandem autem studio maceratus et laboribus assiduis fractus, beatissimam illam immortalitatem cum aerumnosa hac mortalitate, Christi gratia et misericordia, commutavit. Ingenii monumenta varia reliquit: ad meas manus duo pervenerunt, reconditam eruditionem, insignem pietatem et Dei zelum luculenter ostendentia; Lectiones nimirum in Esterem, et Analysis ista Logica in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos: secundum Deum de iis recuperatis gratias ago M. Guilielmo Riresio, Juveni docto et ministro verbi. De hac Analysi, Lector erudite, judicium tuum fore confido, quod nullus unquam Commentarius Analyticus ad Logicae regulas, tanquam ad amussim, tam accurate factus, antehac in lucem prodierit. Bene vale, Lector benevole, in Domino nostro Iesu Christo, et, ad aeternam Dei gloriam, et animae tuae salutem, isthoc fruere, donec alterum opus prodierit; quod cum bono Deo, propediem futurum spero.

Tuus in Domino,

Jo. Adamsonus.

LECTORI.

Vix ullum videas, Lector, prodire libellum,
E mendicatis non tumidum Elogiis.
Quas merces nimium mercator laudat avarus,
Suspectas merito has emptor habere potest.
Hunc ego si possem, nolim laudare libellum,
Nam facile emptorem merx proba repperiet.

M. H. Wallace.

LESSUS IN FUNERE CAROLI FERMAEI.

Quis mihi amaroris tristes porrexerit undas,
Queis caput explere, et rorantes luminis orbes
Larga liquare queam totos in flumina aquarum?
Lumine tam claro cum Ecclesia cassa gemescat,
Fermaeo morte extincto: quem pectore lethe
Nulla meo delere queat, nec iniqua voracis
Temporis invidia imis exstirpare medullis.
Quippe virum gelidam tracta in telluris ad arcton,
Qua colitur Christus Dominus tellure Britanna,
Vix alium invenias parilem pietate, Deique
Zelo, quo totus flagraverat entheus, alma
Quum pietas probitasve malis afflicta gemebat;
Qui verbo et vita solum spirabat Iesum.
Quid memorem ingentes animos? quid dia feracis
Ingenii monumenta canam? quibus aethera pennis
Alta petens, apinas mundi alte despiciebat:
Et, Christi in causa, cuiquam succumbere causae
Aut homini indocilis, fidenti pectore adibat
Et patiebatur, quae homines discrimina quibant
Aut dextra inferre, aut animo intentare feroces:
Nam Dominum vitae et mortis cognovit desum,*
Et Christum in morte et vita lucrum esse sciebat,
Omniaque in mundo compendia stercora duxit.
Tu quanta virtute homines ad caelica regna
Duxeris e tenebris, norunt queis conscia mens est,
Quam tu, divino afflatus spiramine mentem,
Summa sacra Dei panxisti oracla potenter,
Sive homines corde elatos Tu fulmine Legis
Dejicis in Barathrum, terroris dura sagittis
Pectora configens, seu tristi pondere pressas
Peccati recreas Verbi solamine mentes.
Tene igitur siccis oculis meminisse licebit,

* [Qu. Iesum?]

Tam rara virtute virum? Tam dotibus alti
Ingenii clarum, et magnum Jehovae incrementum?
Aut ego, si doleam, coelesti luce receptum,
Vivida te auratis ubi cingit gloria pennis,
Invidiae, Macarita, notam mihi inurere posses.
Sin propriam lugebo vicem, tibi me superesse
Vivum, tam docto et fido monitore carentem,
Memet amore mei dicas studioque teneri.
Ut lachrymis igitur deceat me parcere, non te
Desinet afflictis exstinctum Ecclesia rebus
Plangere, qui promptus fueras succurrere lapsae:
Atque ego, te talem recolens Ecclesiae ademptum,
Et lessum faciam, et rorantes luminis orbes
Larga liquabo mihi totos in flumina aquarum.

Io. Adamsonus moerens
merenti Praeceptori suo parentavit.

AD CAROLUM FERMUM MUTATO NOMINE FIRMUM.

EJUSDEM.

Semper honoratus sis Firmi nomine, nam Tu
Semper pro Christi nomine Firmus eras.
Firmior et rupe es, quae clausa est undique ponto,
Disrumpit fluctu, Firma sed ipsa manet.
Te Papistarum, Praelatorumque catervae
Perdere quum nixi, nixus inanis erat.
Illorum, Domino ceu petrae Firmus adherens,
Contempsisti insons probra ferasque minas.
Nam Christus Firmum sibi te praestare volebat
Et ruit in cassos impia turba suos.
In spumum versae, quae te petiere, feroces
Undae, Tu, ut Bassus, Firmiter usque manes.
Te pietas, te sancta fides, Dominique potenteis
Firmum et invictum constituere manus.

Et verbo et vita, calumoque insignia Christi
Praetuleras populo, ut te sequeretur ovans:
Adduxsti ad Christum multos, nunc tute triumpha
Cum Christo, Angelicis consociate choris.
Ingenii monumenta tui praeclara cluebunt,
Ignea dum volvet lucidus astra polus.
Sed sequiora manent hostes, nisi Christus Iesus
Commiserans, mentes his renovare velit.
Interiere simul, subita grassante ruina,
Pontifices, animam qui petiere tuam:
In squalore jacent, ignominiaque sepulti,
Et meritas poenas impia turba luit.
In spumam et fumum pariter vertantur inamem,
Quotquot de servis sic meruere DEI.
At Firmi maneant Domini qui jussa capessunt,
Atque illis tecum vita beata siet.

EJUSDEM IN DIE OBITUS.

Una luce prius Sol unicus occidit orbi;
Occidere haec soles lux videt una duos.
Sol coelo est Phoebus, terrae Fermaeus, at ille
Luce oculos, caeca hic pectora luce beat.
Sed surget Phoebus luce et Fermaeus eadem,
Quum veniet felix ultimus ille dies.
Postea non surget Phoebus, sed culmina Coeli
Scandet Fermaeus, ut super astra micet.
Purior et Phoebo splendebit terrea moles,
Aeterno felix irradiata die.
Christus, justitiae Sol, tunc erit omnibus omnia,
Illaque Sanctorum gloria Christus erit:
Gloria tunc Patri, aeterno tunc gloria Nato,
Spiritui et Sancto gloria semper erit.

ANOTHER FUNERALL ELEGIE AND ELOGIE IN MEMORIE OF THAT FAITHFULL SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST,

M. CHARLES FERME.

If Learning, Grace and Godlinesse
  Could lengthen humaine life,
So soon, then, had not Atropos
  Drawn forth the fatall knife,
To cut the short threed of thy dayes,
  Scarce fiftie yeers out-spunne,
Nor should another mortall thee
  in length of life out-runne.
But sith thy ghost is gone, and left
  Its little house of clay,
Let all surviving souls be sure
  That here they cannot stay. I. A. *P.*

EPITAPHIUM.

Carolus hic situs est Fermaeus, servus Iesu,
Quo nemo vixit doctior, aut melior.

M. G. Riresius, M V.

[Quae sequuntur sunt ex Simsoni Annalibus deprompta.]

Hoc anno duo in Christo et honorabiles et fidelissimi Dei servi, CAROLUS FERMIUS Frazerburgensis pastor, fere triennio ob hanc Ecclesiae Scoticanae tuitionem incarceratus; necnon ROBERTUS WALLESIUS, Fani Andreae pastor, inde violentia expulsus, et in Tranentum, Lothianae oppidulum, detrusus et ad mortem huic inclusus; ambo inquam hoc anno moriuntur, et felicissime constantissimeque Christi causam morte signavérunt; de quibus:—

Valesius moritur, sic Fer. ius imbribus istis
Hujus opus Boreas: illius Auster habet.
Quos pietas dedit esse pares, carcerque, fidesque,
Immatura, etiam, mors dedit esse pares.

Ad D. CAROLUM FERMIUM sub obitum 24 Septemb: Prosopopeia.

Cujus habet cunas Auster, Boreasque labores
Carcerem et occidui littoris antra nigrum,
Nunc vehitis * liquidas Eoi ad cardinis auras,
Et Solymæ æterno Phœbus ab axe nova es.
Pompeio ô magno major! tres nempe cadenti
Huic patuere plagæ, te quoque quarta capit.

D. WEDERBURNIUS.

In CAROLUM FERMIUM Frazerburgensem, verbo et opere stigmatibusque insignem, ARCHIBALDI SYMSONI *συμπρεσβυτέρου, καὶ συμμαρτυρος Ἐπικηδιον*

Quid tibi vita fuit nisi mors? quid mo[illegible] nisi vita?
Ferme ergo vivis, Ferme etiam mor[illegible]s.
Cum tibi jam Christus, magnum est in funere foenus
Vita etiam Christo victima sacra tuo.
Carole tu vivas, aut tu moriare perinde est
Tam vivens moreris, quam moriendo vives.

Anagramma ejusdem, CAROLUS; O CLARUS.

Cum pietas sincera facit te Carole Clarum
Vero ergo a Claro nomen et omen habes.

* [Qu. veheris?]

Epitaphium Caroli Fermii.

Non hic marmoreo condendus Epi copus antro,
Sed viridi tantum cespite conteg ur;
Non ventri, aut veneri, aut mundo s rvivit, ut ista
Ætas produxit plurima mancipia.
Petro successit zelo, pietate, labore,
Carceribus; necnon vulne re sanguine.
Mitram armenta gerunt, stol n, fatuique cucullum
Et terræ nati regia sceptra petunt.
Carolus igne Dei Borealia frigora solvit
Et verbo et vita lumen erat Boreæ.
Flet Boreas tanto privatum lumine se esse
Tam superis amor est quam Boreæ dolor est.

Ad Episcopos de obitu D. Caroli Fermii Frazerburgensis Episcop Nicodemus.

Vos quibus est curæ sacro redimire tiara
Tempora, queis peplo conciliatur honos,
Gaudete: en vestri similis jam Fermius ille
Carcere nec clausum quem retudisse datum
Vobis pro Sparta solida solitaque docendi
Otia, muta: Suum nec dolet ille gregem
Vos procul a gregibus nisi cum tondenda quotannis
Vellera: es tandem liquit et ille suas.
Vos symista. im censuræ haud subdita turba
Nunc censuræ omnem ridet et ille metum.
Vos Cereri Bacchoque litatis ut aulice: at ille
Aulæi in medio pocula libat ovans
Quique prius renuit minimus vel Episcopus esse
Suspicite en instar jam patriarcha tui est.
Presulibus sic ille prius licet hostis (ut olim,
Vos) nunc inversa vos ratione refert.
Cur? quia dum patriis alios populistis ab arvis,
In patriam hunc vestra est laus pepulisse suam.

A

LOGICAL ANALYSIS

OF THE

EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLE PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

IN WHICH

ALL THE MORE DIFFICULT WORDS, SENTENCES, AND PHRASES, ARE EXACTLY, FULLY, AND CLEARLY EXPLAINED FROM THE SACRED SCRIPTURES:

BY CHARLES FERME,

A MAN OF PROFOUND AND UNIVERSAL LEARNING.

John i. 39.—Come and see.

Rom. viii. 23.—We groan, waiting for the adoption.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY THE HEIRS OF GEORGE ANDERSON,
PRINTER TO THE COLLEGE OF EDINBURGH,
In the year of the Lord 1651.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

THE interesting and valuable relic of a bygone age, of which the following is a Translation, being of a strictly critical and scientific character, I have made it my chief aim to give a faithful transcript of the meaning of the author, even at the expense of an occasional stiffness of manner, or harshness of expression. Nor did it seem to me to be in accordance with the nature and objects of the Society, for which the Translation was undertaken, that the antiquated and scholastic phraseology of the original should be exchanged for more modern and popular language. I have therefore endeavoured to render, as literally as the difference of idiom of the two languages, and a reasonable attention to euphony would permit: I have studied, as far as practicable, to translate the more important words by the same English synonyme throughout: such supplements as were of any moment, or in regard to which I was under any hesitation, have been included within brackets (thus [ ]): and the more obscure and obsolete logical, rhetorical, and ontological terms explained in foot-notes, on their first occurrence.

In regard to the text of Scripture, I judged it necessary to be still more literal; and as our author seems to have used Beza's

version of the New Testament, and that by Junius and Tremellius of the Old, the reader will not be surprised to find that the Scripture quotations do not always tally with our own version; where, as sometimes happens, the chapter and verse are different, those of the English version have been added within brackets.

With the punctuation and division of sentences I have taken greater liberties. Finding that the former was of the most wretched description, I have everywhere pointed in such a manner as seemed to me best calculated to elucidate the sense; and have not scrupled to break down inordinately long sentences into shorter ones, or to group smaller ones together. Wherever the words of the Greek text introduced into the original were accompanied by a Latin version, they have been allowed to retain their places in the Translation, included within brackets; in other cases, they have been turned into English, and the words themselves, at least on the first occurrence of the same term or phrase, given at the bottom of the page.

W. SKAE.

P.S.—I ought perhaps to have noticed the word "*disparate*" in its proper place. This term is variously used and defined by different writers. According to some, "disparates" are—'things so unlike that they cannot be compared together;' according to others, they are—'different species under the same genus:' but Cicero and Quinctilian employ the term in the sense of 'negative-opposite,' (*disparata, ut 'dura' 'non duris.*' Quinct. Inst. Orat. Gernh. V. 11, 31.) It is in the last acceptation that it is commonly used by Mr Ferme.

LOGICAL ANALYSIS

OF THE

EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

THE Apostle, being about to proceed to Rome, sends this Epistle on before him; in which it appears to be his aim and design to prepare the minds of the Romans, by it, as by a sort of Isagoge,* for hearing and eagerly embracing the gospel, when he himself should come and preach it. He seems, therefore, purposely to select for discussion in this Epistle, the position, *that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation;* that is, that the gospel is the sole truth, according to which God is rightly worshipped, and which brings righteousness, peace, and eternal life to men. Having discussed this, he, by way of an appendix or inference, exhorts to a life worthy of the gospel, which is the second part of the preparation.

The Epistle therefore consists of three parts: the first as far as chap. i. verse 16, is the Exordium; in the second part, extending to the 15th verse of chap. xv., the intention and aim of the Apostle is handled, and the minds of the Romans are prepared for hearing the gospel; from chap. xv. verse 15, to the end, there is a lengthened and multifarious conclusion.

[* Introduction, opening of the case.]

CHAPTER I.

Of the Exordium, or first part, there are two sub-divisions; the salutation, as far as verse 8; and thence to verse 11, an attempt to secure the good will of those whom he addresses.

The salutation, according to Paul's usual manner, includes three things; viz., the person saluting, in the first six verses: the persons saluted, with the salutation itself, and prayer, verse 7.

1. "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ,"—the person saluting, who is described by the adjunct of his function and office, first generally—"a servant," then particularly—he is "an apostle." This apostleship of Paul is described by its object—he is a servant or apostle "of the Lord Jesus Christ;" then by its efficient cause—it was not assumed by himself, but he was "called" to the apostleship by the calling of God, separated to preach the gospel of God. His calling Paul explains by a definition; for the calling of Paul to the apostleship is 'his separation to preach the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord:' a definition which is made up of the genus, the calling is 'the separation of the person called;' and the end for the specific difference—'to preach the gospel.'

2. "Which he had promised before through his prophets in the Holy Scriptures." A digression explanatory of the gospel of God, which is described by the adjunct of the promises going before, of which the prophets were the instrumental cause, and the holy Scriptures the subject place.*

3. "Concerning his Son." Here we have a second illustration of the gospel from its subject, which is, the Son of God. He is described, first, by his human nature, and its material cause—he

[* Or place where (they are to be found.)]

was 'made flesh of the seed of David;' secondly, from his divine nature—'he is the Son of God:' this is demonstrated from its effect—'his powerful resurrection from the dead,' which is also explained by its cause—'his own sanctifying spirit.'

4. "(Namely), Jesus Christ our Lord." A third illustration of the Son of God from his names and titles. Of these, the first is taken from his effect* in saving us—he is "JESUS," (Matt. i. 21): the second from the adjunct of his anointing—he is "CHRIST;" and the third, from the dominion procured by him as the author of our redemption—he is our "Lord."

5. "Through whom we have received grace and apostleship." In these words we have a fourth illustration of the Son, from his effects in the case of Paul, or the benefits conferred on him; he gave him the grace of preaching the gospel, and the apostleship by which he was authorised to exercise that grace, and to preach the gospel. "For obedience to the faith among all nations for his name." He explains the grace and apostleship conferred on Paul by its twofold end. Of these the first is—"obedience to the faith,' which is illustrated by its subject—"among the nations." The second and more remote end is—the 'glorifying of the name of Christ' through that obedience; or the *name of Christ* is put for *Christ*, the object of the grace of the faith preached among the nations: for there is no other name, (Acts iv. 12.)

6. "Among whom are ye also." He applies the end of his apostleship to the Romans in this way: The apostleship has been given to me for obedience to the faith among the nations: 'But you are among the nations, therefore also for obedience to the faith among you.' "The called by Christ Jesus," a setting forth and subjoined explanation of those Romans for whose obedience to the faith the apostle has said that the grace of the apostleship had been given to him. They are "the called," not merely by

[* i.e., what was effected or done (by him.)]

external ministration, but by Jesus Christ," that is inwardly and effectually. Thus far of the person saluting.

7. "To all that are in Rome;"—the persons saluted, viz., the Romans, who are described by the adjuncts of the love of God towards them, their calling and saintship. "Grace be to you and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." The third part of the salutation, containing a prayer, in which he invokes upon the Romans the blessings of grace and peace from their causes and authors—"God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ."

8. "In the first place I give thanks to my God through Jesus Christ." Here commences the second part of the exordium, in which he endeavours to gain the good will of the Romans to whom he writes. The arguments are taken from the things done by Paul, of which he here enumerates four, all manifesting in the apostle a friendly disposition towards the Romans, such as merited a reciprocal regard on their part.

The first thing done by him is the giving of thanks. This giving of thanks is illustrated by three particulars: First, By its subject or object, and that twofold; (1.) The ultimate object, which is God, explained by the accompanying profession of Paul, for 'to *my* God,' says the apostle, 'I direct my giving of thanks;' (2.) By the mediate object, which is Jesus Christ, "I give thanks to God through Jesus Christ." Hence Paul wishes to teach the Romans, in passing, that no giving of thanks is either lawful or allowable, which is not presented as a sacrifice to God, or acceptable to God, unless it be presented through Jesus Christ; and, consequently, that the thanksgivings* of the Gentiles, which were offered to idols, as well as those of the Jews, which were offered to God indeed, but not through Christ, were both inappropriate and unacceptable to God; "For you all"—the second particular and the material cause of the thanksgiving of Paul; 'I give thanks to God, and you are the subject-matter,' or 'concerning

* Εὐχαριστίας.

you all.' "That your faith is announced throughout the whole world." This is the third and last particular, and the [occasional] cause of Paul's thanksgiving, viz., the faith of the Romans; 'I give thanks to God concerning you all,' says the apostle, 'and your faith is the occasion;' which faith is explained by the adjunct of its announcement and the subject place of the same; viz., "throughout the whole world." By "faith" I here understand their piety towards God, and profession of the doctrine of faith in word and deed.

9. "For God is my witness;" the second argument for gaining their good will, and the second thing done by Paul, viz., 'the increasing mention made by him of the Romans;' which I conceive is to be understood not merely of the giving of thanks, for that goes before, nor of the prayers, for these follow after, but still more of the anxious zeal and zealous anxiety of Paul in inquiring, on every occasion, into the state and condition of the Romans as it respected God and the gospel of Christ. Hence it would appear that, immediately he has said that the faith of the Romans was announced throughout the whole world—that is, was reported to him by every one in whatever part of the world he might happen to be; it is by way of accounting for this that he immediately subjoins—"For God is my witness that I make mention of you;" as if intimating the reason why that faith of the Romans should be announced to him more than to any other person, namely, because he made mention of them, and enquired concerning their state more frequently than others. Moreover he assures them that he thus made mention of them, by an appeal to Deity, and describes God, as the witness of his anxiety, by the adjunct of his own service; "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his son." This service again is amplified by two particulars: the first of which is the adjunct of the manner of serving "with my spirit;" that is, 'cheerfully, with my whole soul, and unfeignedly;' the second is taken from the subject of his service: "(I serve him) in the gospel."

10. "Always making request in my prayers;" the third argument for good will, and the third thing done by Paul by which he endeavours to secure it, viz., 'the prayers offered up by him to God for the benefit and behoof of the Romans.' These prayers are amplified by their material cause, which is 'his coming to them.' "(I pray) that I may come unto you;" and by the adjunct of the manner of praying, for he prays hypothetically and conditionally—"if a prosperous journey may be granted me by the will of God;" leaving to the will of God the time and the manner of his prosperous journey. In this Paul teaches us by example what James does by precept, viz., that we ought to subordinate all our desires to the will of God in everything in regard to which that will has not been previously ascertained from the word of God, such as are almost all the affairs of this life.

11. "For I greatly desire to see you;" the last argument for good will, drawn from the fourth thing done by Paul, or if you prefer it, from the adjunct of his desire. This desire is illustrated by its twofold end: the first—"that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift;" the second and more remote—"in order that ye may be established."

12. "That is, that being with you, we may be comforted together." This is an epanorthosis * in which he at the same time both corrects and explains the two proximate ends of his desire, and intimates that he desires to be with them, that whatever comfort God might bestow on them through him, he might be a partaker of the same along with them, so that teacher and taught might be encouraged in common, and the faith of each increased to their mutual advantage. By this the apostle teaches us, that the brightest lights in the Church shone by communicating light, were instructed by teaching others, and by ministering to the faith o

[* "A correction in which the writer, as it were, recals himself so as instantly to correct what he has said."—Glass. *Phil. Sac. Tr.* ii. *cap.* 4.]

others, were more and more confirmed in their own belief. (1 Cor. ix. 23.)

13. "For I would not that you should be ignorant, brethren, that I have often times purposed to come unto you." This is said proleptically; for the Romans might say to Paul, 'If you are so very desirous to see us, how is it that you have been so long an apostle without ever coming to visit us?' He answers, 'That he has often purposed to come to them, but that, however desirous, he has been hitherto prevented.' His purpose is amplified by its end; that I might have some fruit among you also: and the end by the like, "even as among other Gentiles."

14, 15. "I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians." Having removed the objection, he returns to his last argument, viz., his desire to see them; a reason for which he here gives from the adjunct of his own debt, which is illustrated by its subjects distributively.* He reasons, therefore, in this way—'I am debtor to all, both Greeks and barbarians, both wise and unwise; therefore, also to you.' "*Consequently*, as much as in me lies, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also."

16. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ." Another proof of the same consequent, drawn from the disparate—If I were ashamed of the gospel, I would refuse to preach it; but I am not ashamed of it. Therefore, as far as in me is, I am ready to preach it.

Thus far the preface and first part of the Epistle. Next in order comes that isagoge by which, as has been said, he prepares the minds of the Romans for the reception of the gospel, if by any means a prosperous journey may at length be granted to him by the will of God, that he may come and preach the gospel to them. This isagoge consists of two parts: The *first*, extending as far as Chap. XII., is a commendation of the gospel; the *second*, reaching

[* By an enumeration of the parties (to whom he was indebted.)]

thence to the 15th verse of Chap. XV., is an exhortation to a life worthy of the gospel.

The substance of the first part is a definition of the gospel. "THE GOSPEL," says Paul, "IS THE POWER OF GOD UNTO SALVATION TO EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH;" a definition consisting of three parts, viz., (1.) The genus—"it is the power of God;" (2.) The end for the specific difference—"unto salvation;" (3.) The subject—which is, "every one that believeth the gospel."

The gospel is said to be "the power of God" by a metonymy of the adjunct for the subject, or, if you prefer it, of the instrumental cause for the effect, which is Christ communicated in the gospel, and received by faith; for He is, properly speaking, "the power and wisdom of God" unto salvation to those who believe, as the apostle teaches, 1 Cor. i. 24. The gospel is called "the power of God," because it is the sole instrument of communicating to us Christ, in whom God acts powerfully, "reconciling the world unto himself" in Him, and "not imputing unto them their trespasses," of which reconciliation and free remission of sins, the gospel, which was "committed to" Paul, is the instrument and "word." (2 Cor. v. 16, 19.)

"Unto salvation." The gospel is said to be "unto salvation," and the knowledge of God, in Christ, by its means, to shew the difference between the gospel and the works of creation, because as the apostle speaks in the 20th verse of this same chapter, "from the creation of the world,"* and "by the things that He has created," which also are the power of God, "the invisible things of God being understood, are clearly seen." The creation of the world, therefore, is the power of God, whereby He himself becomes known, just as by the gospel, but with this difference, that from the gospel He becomes known "unto salvation," whereas, from creation, He becomes known, not to salvation, but to leave men "without excuse," while God judges them; and this difference the apostle notices in 1 Cor. i. 21. Secondly, as the law is opposed to the

* Ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου κτίσεως.

gospel, so the gospel is said to be the power of God "unto salvation," to distinguish it from the "ministration" of the law, since, although the latter is, indeed, the ministration of God, and "glorious," it is, at the same time, "the ministration of death," and that whereby not salvation,—which can only be discovered from the gospel,—but sin becomes known; (see Rom. iii. 20; and 2 Cor. iii. 6.) Thirdly, the gospel is said to be the power of God "unto salvation," to draw away the minds of the Romans from all their idolatrous worship, in which, as the ministration of life and felicity, they had formerly trusted, as the Samaritans in the arts of Simon; the apostle, therefore, wishes to intimate, that all that labour of theirs with which they wearied themselves, in the worship of idols, was fruitless, inasmuch as salvation could become known from the gospel only—"To the Jew first, then also to the Greek." The apostle explains the subject of the salvation of the gospel by an enumeration of its parts, and the adjunct of the order of the parts. That salvation was common both to Jews and Gentiles, but was first of all offered to the Jews, as the first-born of God, and afterwards transferred (as the apostle speaks, Acts xiii. 46) to the Gentiles, here denominated "Greeks."

17. "For through it is God's righteousness revealed from faith to faith." The apostle proceeds to establish the proposition which he has just enunciated,—that the gospel is the power of God "unto salvation,"—and the sole argument which he employs for this purpose is drawn from the effect of the gospel, or of Christ announced in the gospel, namely, 'God's righteousness,' the same which is the proximate cause of salvation. The argument runs thus:—

'Whatever reveals God's righteousness is itself the power of God unto salvation;

'But God's righteousness is revealed by the gospel;

'Therefore, the gospel itself is, to men, the power of God unto salvation.'

By "righteousness," I here understand that righteousness by which men are righteous before God, which is called "God's right

eousness," and not 'man's,' because it is the gift of God, not the merit of man: So that the sense of the proposition is—'that that is the power of God unto salvation by which is revealed that "free gift of God," (as our Lord speaks, John iv. 10,) 'whereby being justified, we are made partakers of God's salvation.' To this the apostle subjoins the assumption in the text: "For through it," that is, 'through the gospel,' "God's righteousness," or 'the free gift of God, by which, being justified, we are made partakers of God's salvation,' "is revealed." This assumption he proves by two arguments, both from testimony. The first is that of the Church, both of ancient and modern times; for so I understand the words, "from faith to faith:" this namely was the belief of the ancient Church—'that righteousness was revealed by the gospel as made known in the promises;' and the same continues to be the belief of the modern Church, viz.:—'that the righteousness of God is revealed in the gospel now more fully made known.' That this is the true interpretation, appears from Acts xv. 10, 11, —"Why tempt ye God," says Peter, "by putting a yoke on the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers, (that is 'the ancient Church') nor we (Christ being now made known) have been able to bear; since we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus, we (the modern and Evangelical Church,) shall be saved even as they, (the Church of the fathers;") Peter, therefore, says,—'that it was the common belief both of the ancient Church, and after them of our's under the gospel, that God's righteousness has been revealed by the gospel.' To this agrees what Paul says, Gal. ii. 15, 16,—"we who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles," that is, 'who are the ancient Church, and have the promises,' "knowing that a man is not justified from the works of the law, but from the faith of Jesus Christ, even we," namely, 'the ancient Church,' says Paul, "have believed on Jesus Christ, that we might be justified from the faith of Christ." So I take it the apostle speaks in this place, as if he had said,—'that God's righteousness is revealed by the gospel, is not a modern doctrine unheard of by our fathers, but is from faith to faith, that is, hav-

ing been believed both in former and recent times, is supported by their united testimony.'

Although the apostle makes frequent use of this argument from the practice and testimony of the ancient Church, to avoid giving offence to his hearers, yet because it might appear weak, as was said by our Lord, (John v. 34,) "I receive not honour from men," he subjoins another argument and testimony taken from the prophet Habakkuk, chap. ii. ver. 4; "The righteous from faith shall live." For if he who is justified from the faith in the gospel has life, then it follows that God's righteousness is revealed through the gospel; or, to speak more plainly, faith embraces the gospel, consequently, he who is righteous before God of faith, is justified by that righteousness which is revealed in the gospel; and as the prophet affirms, that upon that righteousness are conferred life and salvation, he affirms, at the same time, that God's righteousness is revealed from the gospel unto salvation.

18. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness." Thus far the apostle has proved his definition of the gospel, and deduced therefrom his position, that the righteousness by which we are righteous before God, and to which belong salvation and eternal life, is from the faith of the gospel; as this, however, would be questioned alike by Jews and Gentiles, both striving after righteousness from works, the one from the works of the law, the other from those of nature, the apostle makes it the subject of dispute, and discusses it in order. This discussion he makes twofold, agreeably to the testimony of the prophet which he has just cited; for in that testimony of Habakkuk two things are affirmed: the one is, that that righteousness by which man is justified before God is through the faith of the gospel, or through faith in Christ according to the gospel; the other, that life belongs to all those and those only who are righteous of the faith of the gospel, or who are in Christ Jesus, having his righteousness, which is enjoyed through the faith of the gospel. According to this division of the evangelical doctrine of the prophet, the apostle divides

his discussion into two parts, the first of which is on righteousness, continued from this verse as far as chap. viii.; the second, on life, from chap. viii. to chap. xii. Each of these has its own *constructive*, and *destructive reasoning* or *refutation*, by the one of which the apostle first establishes the truth, and then by the other, removes objections against it.

He commences the constructive reasoning of the first part here, and pursues it to the 20th verse of chap. v.; the rest of that chapter and the two following are devoted to the refutation. As regards the *constructive reasoning*, he first proves that righteousness is by faith, as far as chap. v.; he then illustrates it by its effects, from the beginning of that chap. to the 12th ver.; verses 12 to 20 being occupied by the conclusion, which is variously amplified.

The proof consists of three arguments. The first is taken from the disparates of that of which he is speaking, viz., the law of Moses, which was the boast of the Jews, and the law of nature, in which the philosophers and wise men among the Gentiles gloried. The apostle joins these together, as equally opposed to the gospel, and reasons thus:—

'Either man is justified before God from the works of the law, or from faith;

'But he is not justified from the works of the law:

'Therefore he is justified from faith.'

This argument he prosecutes from this place to the commencement of chap. iv.; and first of all proves the assumption,* for he takes the profession† for granted; the sole argument in proof of the assumption being drawn from the adjunct of the common guilt with which all are chargeable:

'All men (both Jews and Gentiles) are chargeable with "all ungodliness and unrighteousness" (*i.e.* with the transgression of both tables of the law);

'Therefore no man, whether he be Jew or Gentile, shall be justified from the works of the law (either the law of Moses or the law of nature).'

[* Or minor premiss.] [† Or major premiss.]

The antecedent is proved, first in common, then by parts.

The common argument is drawn from the effect of ungodliness and unrighteousness, which is—'the wrath of God displayed from heaven in his judgments:'

'The wrath of God is revealed from heaven, or has been displayed in his judgments against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men whosoever they be;

'Therefore all men are chargeable with ungodliness and unrighteousness.'

The antecedent of this enthymeme is contained in the first part of the 18th verse:—"As those who hold the truth in unrighteousness." In this, the second part of the verse, we have the consequent of the last enthymeme,—'therefore all men are chargeable with ungodliness and unrighteousness:' and that is amplified by reasoning from the greater to the less,—'even those possessing the light of godliness and righteousness;' for "the truth" here spoken of is that light and knowledge of one's duty towards God and man which is possessed by means of the law, whether written or unwritten; and to "hold" this "in unrighteousness," is, possessing this, nevertheless to be ungodly and unrighteous, and transgressors of duty contrary to it.

Thus far the common proof of the antecedent, and that all men "hold the truth in unrighteousness," or, which is the same thing, are chargeable with all ungodliness and unrighteousness. He next proves the same thing, in order, by parts: first, in regard to the Gentiles, that they hold the truth in unrighteousness, from the nineteenth verse of the first, to the sixth verse of the second chapter; then, making a transition concerning the Jews also, as far as the twentieth verse of chapter ii.

19. "Because that which may be known concerning God is manifest in them." Of the first part of the proof there are two branches, for the apostle first proves the argument of amplification, namely that the Gentiles possessed the truth, as far as verse twenty-one; then that they held it in unrighteousness, in the

verses that follow. Their possession of the truth is proved by an argument drawn from its efficient cause:

God has made manifest his truth to the Gentiles:

Therefore the Gentiles have possessed the knowledge of the truth of God; or, "that which may be known concerning God is manifest in them."

Both members of this argument are contained in the nineteenth verse; but by Hysterosis * the consequent stands first, and the antecedent comes after it: only we must observe, in regard to the words themselves, that the expression τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, signifies the knowledge of God and of his truth, as far as man, not as now depraved, but with his nature still unimpaired, is capable of it; for since God is infinite he cannot be known by face, that is perfectly, except by himself. Although, therefore, the Gentiles, depraved as man now is, cannot know τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, viz., that which man, had he not fallen, could have known, yet God has made manifest that which may be known concerning himself by man, even in the Gentiles themselves, *i. e.*, among them, (Ps. xix. 1-5.) Hence in 1 Cor. i. 21, that manifestation is called the "wisdom of God," of which the apostle here says, that the knowledge of it remained to some extent even among the Gentiles, and after the fall. The apostle, therefore, affirms these two things:—first, that God had manifested himself in his "wisdom" to the Gentiles, and had communicated the knowledge of himself, so that it might be accessible to and attainable by man; secondly, that even the Gentiles, sensual † and depraved as they were, possessed some portion of this knowledge.

20. "For since the creation of the world, the invisible things of him are perceived." He proves the last-mentioned antecedent, by an argument drawn from the subjects of the manifestation: God is both known by creation, ‡ even "his invisible things," from the things which he has created, and that ever since they

[* Inversion, putting the last first, and the first last.] † ψυχικὸς.
‡ Vg. κτίσει.

were created; Therefore God has made manifest that which may be made known concerning himself, "To wit, both his eternal power and Godhead,"—where "the invisible things of God" are illustrated by an induction of examples. "For this end that they may be without excuse." The apostle here illustrates his last argument, viz., "the manifestation of God by the things which he has created," from its end and use:—'The natural knowledge of God among the Gentiles, although insufficient for salvation, was yet enough to render them inexcusable.'

21. "Because that whilst they knew God, yet they glorified him not as God." Here follows the second branch of the first part of the proof—that the Gentiles, possessing the truth, or the knowledge of God, yet held it in unrighteousness. Of this branch there are two subdivisions, the first relating to all the Gentiles, of whatever state and condition, in common; the second to the wise men among them considered by themselves. The former is contained in the rest of this chapter: the latter in the beginning of the next. The proof of the former, whereby all the Gentiles are convicted of holding the truth in unrighteousness, is taken from the conduct of the Gentiles themselves, and this twofold; first because they had left undone the things which they ought to have done; next, because they had done those things which they ought not to have done. Hence the apostle in this subdivision convicts the Gentiles of two classes of sins, namely, sins of omission and sins of commission. Two sins of omission are enumerated: the first is that they did not glorify God whilst they knew him; the second that they did not thank God for his goodness to them. "But became vain in their reasonings." Here follow the sins of commission, two species of which are enumerated—internal and external. Of the internal he specifies three. The first is vanity—"they became vain." By vanity I understand a going astray from the true God, and from the knowledge of him, yet with a show of knowledge and intelligence. This vanity is illustrated from its instrumental cause, viz., their reasonings; to which

the apostle referring, chap. viiii. ver. 7, says, that "the wisdom of flesh is enmity against God;" that is, as he here speaks, the reasoning of the carnal mind renders vain, and leads away from God and from the knowledge of him.' "And their foolish heart was darkened;" the second internal sin, resulting from that previous vanity of mind, viz., the extinction of the light which God has furnished, and darkness consequently succeeding to the knowledge of the truth.

22. "Whilst professing themselves to be wise they became fools." The third internal sin is the vain glory * whereby they continued satisfied with themselves in their darkness and folly, as if it had been wisdom.

23. "For they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." Thus far the internal sins of the Gentiles; next come the external, and these two-fold: First we have their deeds of ungodliness against the first table of the law—"for they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to the corruptible creature," which is explained by an induction of particulars, viz., 'man, bird, four-footed beast, and creeping thing.' Consequently, this, their first external sin, is idolatry.

24. "Wherefore God abandoned them to the lusts of their own hearts." Next comes their unrighteousness and transgression against the second table, of which the causes are first pointed out, and then the parts enumerated. The causes are two, viz., the proximate, and remote or primary cause. *The proximate is—'their abandonment by God, as a most just judge, whereby he gives them up to the lusts of their own hearts unto uncleanness, so as to dishonour their own bodies between themselves;' this cause being illustrated by its end, which is—'the visiting of their

* Κινοδοξία.

ungodliness with its just recompense,' as the apostle afterwards speaks, (verse 27.)

25. "As those who changed the truth of God into a lie." The other and primary cause, or the reason for which God, as a most just judge, had abandoned them to their own affections, was their own previous sin—"they changed the truth of God into a lie," this, as has been already said, being one of their internal sins; "and worshipped and served created things to the neglect of the Creator," which, as before explained, was their external idolatry. "Who is blessed for ever, Amen!" To represent in a more aggravating light the idolatry of the Gentiles, the apostle describes God the creator—the worship due to whom, the Gentiles had transferred to other objects—by His eternal blessedness; and he does so designedly, in order to shew the Gentiles that, ruinous to themselves as their idolatry would prove, it neither had detracted, nor could detract any thing from God; which he confirms by signifying his own approbation, expressed by the word "Amen!"

26. "For which cause (I say) God abandoned them to vile affections." This is the consequent of the enthymeme, whereby he deduces the proximate cause of the unrighteousness of the Gentiles from the primary, which was their own sin—partly external, and partly internal; and so the apostle has thus far been shewing the causes of the unrighteousness of the Gentiles, and of that transgression of the second table, for which they were remarkable, namely, first, their own ungodliness, and, next, the wrath of God stirred up to take vengeance, whereby they were abandoned to their own affections, which led to indulgence in every thing that was vile. Next come the parts of this unrighteousness, the first of which is that abominable and unnatural fornication,—"For both their women changed their natural* use into that which is against nature." This is first explained by distributing the subjects of it. It was the crime of the women—"both their women

* Παρὰ φύσιν.

changed their natural use into that which is against nature;" it was the crime of the men—"and the men burned in their lust one toward another." Secondly, it is illustrated by its equal*: this vile and unnatural fornication was the equal recompense of their error—that is, of their idolatry and spiritual adultery.

28. "And even as they did not think proper to retain God in their knowledge, so, &c." He passes on to an enumeration of the other parts of their unrighteousness, after again stating the causes of it, which are set forth under a comparison of likeness.

29. Being filled with all unrighteousness—the enumeration itself consisting of many parts.

32. "Who, after they knew the judgments of God." He here concludes the first subdivision of his proof concerning the Gentiles, namely, that the Gentiles, in general, (knowing the judgment of God, which the apostle explains in a parenthesis,—'that they who did such things' against the law of God 'were worthy of death,') 'both did the same themselves,' which he illustrates from the greater, 'and not only so, but also took the part of others who did these things:' that is, they held this judgment of God, and the knowledge of the truth, in unrighteousness, as affirmed at the outset.

CHAPTER II.

THUS far it has been proved concerning the Gentiles in general, both that they possessed the truth, and that, possessing it, they held it unrighteousness. With this chapter commences the second and special subdivision of the proof, which relates to the philosophers of the Gentiles, considered by themselves, whom the apostle, in 1 Cor. i. 20, denominates "the wise men and disputers of the

* i. e., Appropriate or due.

world;" and again, in 1 Cor. xi. 8, "the princes of this world." The apostle charges these persons—who boasted of their knowledge of God, and vaunted themselves as the teachers of others, and the reprovers of unrighteousness and ungodliness in others—with being themselves guilty of ungodliness and unrighteousness, and also with holding the knowledge of the truth in unrighteousness.

Of this subdivision the proposition is, "Oh, man! whosoever thou art that judgest (another)," in which words the apostle describes the censorious and moral philosophers among the Gentiles, by their effecting, judging, and accusing others of sin, in order that they themselves might be esteemed the more holy. "(Even) thou (thyself) art inexcusable;" that is, 'thy knowledge of the truth of God has its own end in thy just condemnation,' or, 'so as to render thee inexcusable when God judgeth thee,' as the apostle has before said; chap. i. 20.

1. "Wherefore thou art inexcusable, oh man! whosoever thou art, that judgest others." The first argument in support of his proposition is deduced from the foregone conclusion, by which the apostle has concluded, that the Gentiles in general, knowing the judgment of God, yet did things contrary thereto; and therefore, that proposition is enunciated illatively, and as a sort of secondary conclusion—"*Wherefore* thou art inexcusable," &c.; "for, in the act of judging another thou condemnest thyself." The argument runs thus:—

Whosoever condemns himself in the act of judging another is inexcusable:

"(But) thou, O man," says the apostle, addressing the Gentile philosophers individually, "in the act of judging another, condemnest thyself;"

"Therefore thou art inexcusable." The proposition is awanting; but the other two parts of the syllogism are given in the verse, only that the assumption, by hysterosis, is placed after the conclusion, "Thou that judgest another doest the same things." He proves the assumption by an argument drawn from the effects of

him who thus judged another, which effects are set forth under a comparison of equality—He who does the same things for which he judges another, in the act of judging another, condemns himself;

'But thou,' says the apostle to each of the Gentile philosophers, 'that judgest another doest the same things for which thou judgest another;

'Therefore, in the act of judging another thou condemnest thyself.'

The assumption is expressed in the words just quoted, which form the last clause of this verse; but, by hysterosis, the proposition, with its proof, is given in the two following verses; the proof in the second, and the proposition itself therefrom deduced in the third.

2. "But we know that the judgment of God is according to truth." The arguments of the proof are two. The first is taken from the adjunct of the judgment of God:—"The judgment of God is according to truth," which the apostle confirms by our own testimony, that is, by the testimony even of natural men (φυσικῶν ἀνθρώπων) themselves; "We know." To be "according to truth" here signifies, to be without partiality.*

God judges "according to truth," or he is impartial† in his judgment; 'Therefore whoever judges another, while he does the same things himself, is equally inexcusable with him whom he judges.'

"Against those who commit such things;" the second argument of the proof, drawn from the object of the judgment of God: The object of the judgment of God, and the guilty‡ in his sight, are those who commit such things," *i. e.* things unlawful,§ whosoever they be, whether reprovers or reproved; therefore those who, while judging others, commit the same things themselves, are equally guilty with those whom they judge.

3. "And thinkest thou this, O man!" &c. We have here the

* Προσωποληψία. † Ἀπροσωπολήπτως. ‡ Ὑπόδικοι. § Ἄνομα.

consequent of each of the preceding enthymemes, which is also the proposition of the second syllogism submitted to the judgment of these wise men themselves:—"(Thou) who judgest them that do such things, and doest the same, thou shalt not escape the judgment of God," or, 'in judging them thou condemnest thyself;' which, says Paul, 'I submit to thine own judgment, that thou mayest say what thou thinkest of it.'

4. "Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long-suffering." The apostle here makes a transition to the second argument, by which he proves, that the wise men among the Gentiles were likewise inexcusable before God, by proleptically anticipating the objections which they would be ready to start:—'God has hitherto borne with me, and I have had experience of his goodness; therefore I will make amends to him by reproving others, and although I do the same things myself I shall escape his judgment.' To this the apostle replies:—'Nay! thou who doest the same things, for which thou judgest another, thou art just so much the more liable to the judgment of God, that hitherto God has been good to thee. The apostle reasons from the effect of his having so long experienced the long-suffering of God, which effect is his despising God's long-suffering and goodness; this is the first argument of the reply:—'Thou despiseth the long-suffering of God; therefore God's long-suffering renders thee so much the more inexcusable.'* "Not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance;" this is the second argument of the reply, drawn from the end of God's goodness to the wicked, which is illustrated by their own ignorance of it. The goodness of God towards the wicked should lead them to repentance; or which is the same thing,—'He is good to thee,' says the apostle, 'that he may afford thee time and move thee to repent; therefore as thou dost not repent, thou art inexcusable, and shalt not escape his judgment.' The apostle therefore replies to the objection by denying the consequence,—

* Ἀναπολόγητος.

'It is true God has been good to thee, but it does not follow from that that thou shalt escape his judgment;' and this negation of the consequence he proves by two arguments; the one taken from the conduct of the wicked man—"thou despisest the goodness of God;" the other from the end of God's goodness, which is the wicked man's "repentance."

5. "But according to thy hardness, and heart incapable of repentance;"—the second argument by which he proves that the wise men among the Gentiles were inexcusable, * and would not escape the judgment of God. The argument is taken from the adjuncts of God's benefits, and the time afforded them for repentance, which they despised; or it may be said to be drawn from the effects partly of God in bestowing his benefits and affording time for repentance, and partly of themselves in despising these benefits and not repenting. 'Every one to whom God is good and affords time for repentance, treasures up to himself wrath against the day of wrath if he does not repent; But God in his goodness,' says the apostle to each of the philosophers of the Gentiles, 'affords thee time for repentance, and thou dost not repent: Therefore "thou treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath."'

The assumption is doubly illustrated. First, by the greater—'not only dost thou not repent, but what is more, thou *canst* not repent,' as is afterwards said concerning "the flesh," chap. viii. 7; that "it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed *can* be." Secondly, by the cause of this inability (ἀδυναμία) to repent, namely, the hardness of heart contracted by long habit in sinning against the conscience, which the apostle, Eph. iv. 19, denominates insensibility (ἀπαλγησία): this insensibility, as may be seen by referring to the passage, is the effect of "walking in the vanity of their mind," † and is, in its turn, the cause of that licentiousness (ἀσέλγεια), by which they "work all uncleanness with greediness": that is, it arises, as we have said, from sinning against the conscience, and holds so firmly in sin, that the sinner cannot grieve

* Ἀνυπολόγητον. † Τοῦ πεπωρωμένου τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ νοός.

for his sin unto repentance. "Thou treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath." The conclusion is also illustrated by the greater, and by the adjunct of the time: by the greater "not only shalt thou not escape wrath and judgment, but through thine impenitence and contempt of God's forbearance thou *treasurest up* wrath unto thyself"; by the adjunct of the time—"the day of wrath," defined as "the day of the revelation of the just judgment of God," that is, as Peter calls it, "the day of the Lord," and of the brightness of his coming, on which his judgment against those who now securely despise his forbearance will be revealed to all.

6. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds." Here commences a digression in which the apostle vindicates the justice of the judgment of God, and stops the mouths of all who, as is usual on such occasions, utter complaints against their judge, be they Jews or Gentiles. For, in the preceding part of the chapter, the apostle has close pressed the wise men among the Gentiles, and brought them in guilty step by step, by a sort of climax; the first step was,—"Thou art inexcusable, Oh man!"; the second—"Thou shalt not escape the judgment of God"; the third—"Thou treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath," that is, not merely wrath and judgment, but a treasure of judgment is in store for thee: the Gentile philosopher, perceiving that he is amenable to such penalties, begins to murmur against that judgment, as unjust, in which complaint he is joined by the Jew, the hearer of the law: the apostle therefore, in this digression, stops the mouths of both, and at the same time that he shuts them up under judgment vindicates the justice of that judgment. The vindication contains two arguments. The first of these is taken from a comparison of equality between the deed and the reward or punishment attached to the deed: Whenever the reward or punishment rendered to a man is according to his deed, that is, equal to it, that judgment is just;

But God in his judgment renders to every man according to his deeds:—

Therefore the judgment of God is just.

The assumption is contained in the text, and is doubly enunciated. First, by an abridged comparison, which is indicated by the expression, "According to"—"God will render to every man *according to* his deeds."

7. "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing." Secondly, by an extended comparison, in which there is a distribution, both of the deeds, and of their consequences; the latter are divided into rewards and punishments, and its own appropriate consequence is annexed to every man's deed. The deeds are either good or evil. The good deeds are defined by their end and adjunct: the adjunct is—perseverance; the end—"glory, honour and immortality." To these deeds, says the apostle, God, who is just, and the judge of the world, awards "eternal life."

8. "But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth." Then there are evil deeds, of which the apostle here enumerates two species. The first of these is "contention," by which I understand all that reasoning by which the Gentiles, 'whilst they boasted that they were wise, became fools,' as he formerly said, "And that do not obey the truth." The second species of evil deeds is the effect of the contentions or various discussions of the philosophers which is here represented as twofold. The first is a sin of omission—"they do not obey the truth," that is, as he said before, "knowing God, they yet glorify him not as God." "But obey unrighteousness"—the second effect of their contentions and disputings, which is a sin of commission, the commission, namely, of "all unrighteousness," with which he formerly said that the Gentiles were "filled," and which he traced to their refusing to obey the truth, chap. i. 28, 29. To these will be rendered "indignation and wrath," the equal and appropriate punishment which, by the judgment of God, is rendered to evil deeds. The apostle therefore explains his abridged comparison—"God will render to every man according to his deeds"—in this way:—'God

awards eternal life to him who does well if he persevere, but he is wroth with, and in his wrath awards death to all that do evil, such as are even you wise men among the Gentiles, contending and becoming vain in your contentions: for the apostle in this place purposely comprises evil deeds under the heads of evil contention and its effects, that he may bring home the charge to the Gentile philosophers, all whose discussions concerning God and duty, and the supreme good, amounted to nothing more than an evil contention.

9. "Tribulation and anguish against every soul of man that doeth evil." Next follows the second argument by which the apostle vindicates the justice of the judgment of God, which is taken from the adjunct of its impartiality:* Whatever judgment is impartial† that is, "according to truth," as he formerly said, and without respect of persons is just:

But "there is no respect of persons with God;"

Therefore the judgment of God is just. The assumption is first proved in verses 9 and 10, in which the Apostle shews that both in punishing unrighteousness and rewarding good deeds God is the same both to Jews and Gentiles. The argument is consequently inductive, the first part of the induction being contained in this verse:—God is the same both to Jews and Gentiles in exercising judgment, or—'affliction and anguish shall be upon every soul that doeth evil whether Jew or Gentile.'

10. "But glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good,"—the second part of the induction:—God is the same to both Jews and Gentiles in rewarding righteousness. The distinction, however, made between these two classes, by the order in which they are named, is deserving of attention, namely, that the Jew is both first in judgment, when he does evil, on account of his ingratitude, as it is said:—"It shall be more tolerable for So-

* Ἀπροσωπολημψία. † Ἀπροσωπόλημπτον.

dom and Gomorrha, than for those that despise the gospel;' and first also in grace, on account of their election, as the apostle speaks, and because they are the natural branches of the olive-tree.

11. "For there is no respect of persons with God." This is the assumption—the judgment of God is impartial.

12. "As many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law,"—a second argument in proof of the assumption from the destruction of all sinners alike (which is the effect of the just judgment of God), whether they have sinned with or without the written law.

13. "For not the hearers of the law,"—a prolepsis, in which he anticipates the objections of the Jews against the last argument for the assumption. 'We hear the law,' say the Jews, 'therefore we shall not be judged by the law.' The apostle replies, that it does not follow, and that it is the sophism of assigning that as a cause which is no cause; for that it is not the hearing of the law but the doing of it that justifies; consequently, even those who sin in the law, that is, who sin while they have and hear the law, shall yet be judged by the law.

14. "For when the Gentiles who have not the law, do by nature the things which are of the law,"—a second prolepsis, by which he anticipates the objections of the Gentiles against the last argument for the assumption:—'Where the law is not,' say they, 'there is no transgression of the law.'

'But we have not the law; therefore there is in us no transgression of the law. Consequently, since we cannot sin without the law, neither can we perish without the law, contrary,' they might say to the apostle, 'to what you affirm.'

The proposition is that of the apostle, chap. iv. 15. They seem to suppose that he grants them the assumption also, when he speaks of them as being "without the law;" but the apostle re-

plies that, although they are without the written law, yet they are not altogether without law, and that they, therefore, assume what is not true. Accordingly, he here proves, that although the Gentiles do not possess the written law, yet they are not without law. The arguments by which he establishes his proposition are two. The first is:—

Those who are a law unto themselves are not without law:

The Gentiles are a law unto themselves:

Therefore they are not without law.

The assumption is thus proved:—

Those who, having not the written law, do by nature the things which are of the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:

But the Gentiles, having not the written law, do by nature the things which are of the law;

Wherefore they are a law unto themselves.

The assumption of the latter syllogism is first given, and then the conclusion in the words—"These having not the law, are a law unto themselves."

15. "As those who shew the work of the law written on their hearts,"—the second argument by which the apostle proves that the Gentiles are not without law:—

Those, on whose hearts the work of the law is written, are not without law:

But the work of the law is written on the hearts of the Gentiles:

"Their conscience at the same time bearing witness;"—the assumption is proved by an induction of the parts of the work of the law written on their hearts: the parts are two; the one—'the testimony of conscience;' the other—'the mutual accusing and excusing of their thoughts.'

Thus far the objections, first of the Jews, and then of the Gentiles, against his last argument, and the equity of the destruction of sinners of both classes alike, have been removed.

16. "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men." This destruction of Jewish and Gentile sinners alike, he illustrates by the adjunct of the time, which is described by its subject: it is—"the day on which God shall judge." This judgment of God is amplified, first by its subject, set forth by an implied comparison of majority—'God will judge, not merely the open, but the secret sins of men.' "According to my gospel." Secondly, this judgment of God is illustrated by its efficient causes: both the principal, which is Jesus Christ; and the instrumental, which is the gospel that Paul preached.

And here it is to be observed, that, although he has said that sinners will perish, either by the law of nature, if they have sinned without the law, or by the written law, if they have sinned under the law; yet he says that that just judgment of God will be according to the gospel; because, of a truth, the Lord is just, and his judgment is just, in both condemning and acquitting by the gospel alone. For by the law it will be impossible for any one to be justly acquitted, whether it be the written law or the law of nature, as the apostle is afterwards about to show; whereas by the gospel, both the condemnation of unbelievers and the acquittal of believers will be just: since, in addition to the other sins of which the former are convicted by the law, they have despised the grace of the gospel; and because the latter possess, through the gospel, the righteousness of Christ, which is all-sufficient for their acquittal. With regard, therefore, to what the apostle has said in verses 7 and 10,—'that eternal life, glory, honour and peace will be given to him that worketh good,'—he does not thereby intimate that it is possible for any one to be justified by the law on the ground of his own works; but by shewing, both to Jews and Gentiles, that the sole condition of justification by the law is, that they keep it perfectly, and work well in all things,—a condition which both must be conscious was not theirs,—he wishes to urge them to betake themselves to Christ, that they may be justified from the gospel.

17. "Behold thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law. Thus far the first part of the proof in which he has established, both concerning the Gentiles in general, and concerning their wise men in particular, that they hold the truth of God in unrighteousness, and has vindicated, in passing, against the complaints both of Jew and Gentiles, the justice of the judgment of God to which he has made the Gentiles liable. Next comes the second part of the proof, viz.: that even the Jews themselves, who possess the truth in the written law, held that truth in unrighteousness; the whole of which discussion is prolepticál, and consists in a refutation of the Jews glorying in their privileges over the Gentiles. The first prolepsis occupies the remainder of the chapter, and is divided into two sections; the former of which, extending to verse 21, contains an enumeration of the prerogatives of the Jews, and the latter, the subjoined reply of the apostle.

Three prerogatives of the Jews are here enumerated. First, they glory in the name of 'Jew.' Secondly, they glory in God and in his law, because, forsooth, unlike other nations, each of which had its own idols and false god, they alone worshipped the true God, and were possessed of the law delivered to them by himself. These two prerogatives are comprised in the 17th verse.

18. "And knowest his will." The third prerogative is contained in this and the two following verses,—'they glory in the knowledge which they had obtained from the law.' This the apostle variously amplifies in accordance with their own ideas: first, by its object—because it is the knowledge of the will of God, and of those things that are at variance with that will; then by its effects—by means of it, truly, the Jews are the guides of the blind, give light to them that sit in darkness, and are the teachers of the foolish and of babes.'

21. "Thou, therefore, who teachest another, teachest thou not thyself?" The apostle here replies to this threefold glorying of the Jews; but by hysterosis, he begins with the last, viz., their

glorying in their knowledge. This he shews to be vain, by reasoning from the less to the greater:—'thou dost not even teach thyself: 'Therefore thy parade of thy knowledge is worthless.'

"Thou that preachest that a man should not steal, thou stealest." He proves the antecedent from the conduct of the Jews, and by an induction of the violated law:—

'Thou that preachest and teachest that another should not steal, should not commit sacrilege,' (from the eighth commandment); 'should not commit adultery,' (from the seventh); 'should abhor, idols,' (from the first and second commandments); 'art thyself guilty of stealing, of adultery, and of sacrilege:'

'Thou, therefore, that gloriest in being a teacher of others, dost not so much as teach thyself.'

23. "Thou that gloriest in the law, through transgression of the law, dishonourest thou God?"

He next replies to the second prerogative, and shews their boasting in God and in the law to be vain, from their own conduct viz., their transgression of the third commandment; for by transgressing the whole law they brought disgrace upon the law and upon God, that is, exposed at the same time both God and his law to be blasphemed by others, which was tantamount to blaspheming the name of God, and violating the third commandment themselves. Hence the apostle supplies us with two notable things for the right understanding of the third commandment: first, that he who gives occasion to others to blaspheme is guilty of blasphemy himself; and, secondly, that an occasion is given to the ungodly to blaspheme by the transgression of any one of the commandments, and, consequently, whatever be the commandment transgressed, that the transgression of it is also a violation of the third commandment; see 2 Sam. xii. 14.

24. "For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you;"—he proves the foregoing act of the Jews in

dishonouring God through their transgression of the law, from the testimony of the prophets; Isaiah iii. 5; Ezek. xxxvi. 23.

25. "For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law."

We have here a prolepsis by which the apostle anticipates the objections of the Jews against his last accusation:—

'We are circumcised, and keep all the ceremonies of the law;" (for so I take it, circumcision is here to be understood by synecdoche of the species for the genus, as the apostle seems to intimate, Gal. v. 2.);

'Therefore we do not dishonour God.'

The apostle replies that it does not follow, and that they reason from that which is no cause, as if it were a cause; for that God is glorified, not by circumcision and the external signs of service, but by a godly life, and the keeping of the moral law, of which circumcision is the sacrament.* Consequently, that circumcision profits the circumcised for glorying in God and glorifying the name of God among the Gentiles, only hypothetically and conditionally, viz., if they themselves keep the law, which is the true cause. "But if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." He here proves his own reply, and the conditional use of circumcision, from what equally follows on the contrary supposition:—

'If thou be a transgressor of the law, thy circumcision becomes uncircumcision, and is nothing worth;

'Therefore, contrariwise, circumcision profits only if thou keep the law.'

26. "If the uncircumcision, therefore, keep the ordinances of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision?" From his last reply the apostle deduces a double inference and a twofold secondary conclusion. Of these the first is—'that uncircumcision keeping the law is reckoned for or is equivalent to

* Or pledge; *i. e.* to which one becomes pledged in consequence of submitting to the ordinance of circumcision.

circumcision;' for if the whole advantage * of circumcision depends upon the keeping of the law, it follows that the uncircumcision which keeps the law has the same advantage with circumcision.

27. "And shall not the uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it keep the law, judge thee, who, through the letter and circumcision, art a transgressor of the law?" This is the second inference:—'Uncircumcision keeping the law will judge circumcision,' *i. e.* 'will be an argument for judgment against the circumcision of those that transgress the law;' for if the advantage of circumcision be the keeping of the law, the uncircumcision which has the advantage attaching to circumcision is better than the circumcision which is without the keeping of the law. Which is the advantage of the law.

28. "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly." The apostle now answers the first boast of the Jews, viz., their glorying in the surname of Jew, and shows that this is no true cause for glorying: and thus, throughout the whole of his reply, the apostle proves that these Jews reasoned falsely from what was no cause, and deceived themselves. This third answer is borrowed from the definition of a Jew, and consists of two parts, an arsis† and a thesis.‡ For in the first part, which is contained in the 28th verse, he shews who is not a Jew, viz., one who is a Jew outwardly, that is, by surname, (as he has said above), or by the letter, (as he afterwards speaks); or, which is the same thing, all are not Jews who are the children of Judah by carnal descent: So chap. ix. 6. "Nor is that circumcision, which is circumcision outwardly," *i. e.* "in the flesh." He here illustrates the arsis from the like which has just before been demonstrated; as the external sacrament of circumcision, and the cutting off of the foreskin, is not that true circumcision in which one may glory, (as has just been demon-

* Or superiority. † A negation. ‡ An affirmation.

strated), so to be a Jew outwardly is not to be a real Jew, nor can that properly be made a subject of glorying.

29. "But he is a Jew who is one inwardly;"—this is the thesis, "and circumcision is that of the heart:"—he illustrates the thesis from the like, as he had formerly done in the case of the arsis. "(That is) in the spirit not in the letter." He here defines what it is to be a Jew inwardly by its formal cause, and the adjunct of the praise connected therewith; each being expressed by contrasting it with something distinct from it. 'To be a Jew inwardly, is to be a spiritual Jew, or a Jew in the spirit, and not in the letter.' The apostle here opposes "the letter" to "the spirit:" consequently as by "the spirit" is denoted the internal grace of faith and sanctification; so by "the letter" we are to understand whatever is external and visible to every one, whether it be natural descent or the common profession [of religion], and participation in its external services. Therefore by the shewing of the apostle it is the spirit and internal grace, not any thing external, by which he who is truly a Jew is what he is, viz., "a Jew." "Whose praise is not from men, but from God." This is the second part of the definition, and the adjunct of the praise or commendation enjoyed by him who is truly a Jew, which is explained by contrast from its efficient cause,—'The praise of him who is truly a Jew, is not from men, but from God.'

CHAPTER III.

1. "What advantage then hath the Jew, or what is the benefit of circumcision?" This is the second objection of the Jews, suggested by the last reply of the apostle, in which he has refuted the prerogatives enumerated by the Jews, and set them aside, so as to place the Jews on the same level with the Gentiles, concluding both under sin and death. Hence the Jews rejoin,—'Accord-

ing to your opinion, therefore, Paul, there is no advantage in being a Jew, nor in circumcision, and the law of Moses;' for so, by synecdoche of the part for the whole, circumcision is put for the entire Mosaic law. Since the Jews urge this negation from the foregoing refutation in an interrogative form, as involving a most manifest absurdity, the sense is,—'Unless you admit the privileges which we have specified, we do not know what is the advantage of being a Jew rather than a Gentile, or of having the law of Moses more than of wanting it; tell us if *you* know of any.'

2. "Much in every way"—a hypophora* or the subjoined reply in which the Apostle, rejecting as worthless those prerogatives in which the Jews gloried, shews that there remains to the Jew great advantage in every way. "For there is this chiefly, that unto them were committed the oracles of God." By an instance† or particular example, he here confirms his reply, and removes the universal negation of the Jews. They said that if the prerogatives enumerated were not admitted as such, then the Jew had none: The apostle maintains, on the contrary, that besides these there was another superior to these, and the chief one, namely—that unto them were committed the oracles of God; that is, as he afterwards explains, chap. ix. 4, that their's were the promises, and according to the promises, the adoption, the glory, the covenant, the constitution of the law, and the service. The apostle, therefore, withdraws the Jews from glorying in the flesh and in external privileges that he may base both their glorying in themselves and in their external privileges upon the prerogative of grace through the promises; which promises he here denominates "the oracles of God," and as he speaks in 1 Cor. i. 31—quoting from Jeremiah —"he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord."

3. "For what if some did not believe, shall their unbelief make

* A suggestion in way of reply. † Example urged in way of objection.

void the faith of God?" This is the third objection of the Jews, also suggested by the foregoing reply; for they attempt to remove the prerogative of grace through the promises, that they may retain their own, namely, either that the Jew has no advantage, or that he has those which they have specified; in a word, the Jews, by this objection, endeavour to set aside the instance of the apostle, and reason thus:—'All did not believe the oracles and promises of God,'—which the apostle admits in the beginning of the 3d verse—'therefore no advantage belongs to the Jew nor to circumcision.' Their argument, stated at length, would be as follows:—

'The advantage of being a Jew, and of circumcision, ought to be universal and common to all.'

But all have not had the oracles and promises of God committed to them, (the proof of this being—that all did not believe, which, as has been said, the apostle admits.)

'Therefore, neither is this prerogative common to all, and consequently it is no prerogative.' The apostle replies to the proof of the assumption, and shews that it does not follow, because some do not believe that the oracles of God were not committed to them according to the word of his promise;—'for in that case the unbelief of some would render void the faith of God; but the latter cannot be.' The assumption * is comprised in the question and subjoined answer of the apostle—"Shall their unbelief make void the faith of God? the answer is—"far from it:", he denies with abhorrence that the faith of God can be nullified by the unbelief of some of the Jews; whence he draws the conclusion that it does not follow that the oracles of God were not committed to these persons, because they themselves did not believe. By this the apostle teaches us two things; first, that the oracles of God have been committed, (that is, the word of the gospel and the signs of it have been given,) even to hypocrites in the visible Church; secondly, that in order to our becoming partakers of grace there is

* Viz., the consequent of this enthymeme, (or minor premise of the preceding hypothetical syllogism.)

need not only for the exhibition of the oracles of God, but also for our apprehension of them by faith, which is the work of the Holy Spirit.

4. "Yea let God be true, but every man a liar." The apostle here amplifies the foregoing assumption by a comparison of majority:—the lying of all men will not render void the faith of God, since were every man a liar, yet God himself remains true; much less therefore can the unbelief of some men render void the faith of God. "As it is written, That thou mayest be justified in thy sayings and mayest overcome when thou judgest." He proves the comparison of majority by the testimony of scripture, and that twofold: the first part proves that God is true, for he who is justified in his sayings is true; the second that man is a liar, for if the Lord overcomes when he judges, then is man overcome, *i. e.*, he is found a liar and a covenant-breaker when he is judged.

5. "But if our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God what shall we say? Is God unjust who inflicteth punishment?" Because it appears from the foregoing reply, that the lying and unbelief of men cannot render void the faith of God, but that the faith, and truth, and righteousness of God are manifested by the unbelief, lying and unrighteousness of man, there hence arises a fourth prolepsis consisting of two parts: The first being contained in verses 5 and 6, the second in verses 7 and 8. The first part is,—'If our unrighteousness,' say the Jews, 'commend the righteousness of God, our lying the truth of God, and our unbelief the faith of God, it is unjust that the Lord should punish our unbelief, lying and unrighteousness; you, Paul, assert the former; therefore the latter follows." "I speak after the manner of men." We have next a threefold reply of the apostle: first, he excuses himself for having stated an objection of this kind, and says that it was not started by his own mind, but by the mind of men, *i.e.* "sensual men," and "men of corrupt judgment," as he elsewhere speaks; whereby he warns

Christian men to abstain from blasphemous objections against the truth.

6. "Far from it"—the second part of the reply, in which he rejects the conclusion with abhorrence.—'Far be it from me that I should think or teach that it is unjust in God to punish our unrighteousness, lying, and unbelief.' "Else how shall God be the judge of the world?"—the third part of the reply, containing a proof of the negative of the proposition from the received and common testimony concerning God. For the apostle takes for granted, from the common opinion of all men, especially of the Jews, who had been taught out of the law, that God will be the judge of the world: and he here enquires how this common testimony can be consistent; intimating that it is impossible it can be consistent with the blasphemous proposition of the last syllogism of the Jews.

7, 8. "For if the truth of God hath redounded by my lying to his glory, why am I still condemned as a sinner?" This is the second part of the prolepsis, expressed by a comparison of majority: 'If the truth of God redounds by my lying to his glory, not only am I not to be condemned as a sinner, but evil is to be done that good may come;' that is—'I must follow after sin with the greater zeal, that God may be the more glorified by my unrighteousness.'

'But you, Paul, assert the former:'

'Therefore you affirm the latter also, viz.—that evil is to be done that good may come.'

The proposition with the conclusion are given in the text; the conclusion being amplified by the false and slanderous testimony of many, and inserted within a parenthesis.

"Whose condemnation is just." To this syllogism, as being manifestly absurd, the apostle makes no reply, but opposes the just condemnation of God to those who falsely charged him with the conclusion.

9. "What then? We do excel?" This is the last prolepsis of the Jews from the preceding discussion of Paul, in which he has vindicated the faith of God in the promises made to the fathers, and magnified his grace towards the Jews, who were for the most part unworthy and unbelieving, whose unbelief however did not render void, but rather commended the righteousness of God. From this discussion the Jews at length rise up and claim to themselves an advantage over the Gentiles, as now established by the support of Paul himself; as if they had said:—'What! does not your whole reasoning go to shew that we have an advantage, and that much in every way (as before said); and are you not therefore wrong in comparing us to the Gentiles, and concluding that we are equally liable to judgment with them?' "For no way" —a hypophora, or the subjoined reply of the apostle, in which he convicts the Jews of sophistry, in arresting his reasoning concerning the grace of God communicated to the Jews in the promises, to their own justification, and that by the laws. The sense of his words therefore is:—'although we Jews much excel the Gentiles in having the oracles of God committed to us, that is, have the advantage over them in respect of God who has been more gracious to us, or has imparted greater advantages to us than to them; yet as regards justification by the law, and in respect of ourselves "We in no way" excel or are better than the Gentiles themselves.' That this is the purport of the reply, is proved by what immediately follows. The Jews, therefore, have the advantage of the Gentiles in respect of grace, which is what the apostle has argued; but not in respect of justification by the law, which is the point in question. For we have before brought the charge against both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin. He here proves his last reply, or that the Jews in no way have the advantage over the Gentiles as regards justification by the law. To prove this he adduces the conclusion previously argued, viz.: —that all, both Jews and Gentiles, were sinners, and held the truth of God in unrighteousness, as aforesaid: and the apostle does this designedly, for as the Jews had abused his last discussion

to support their own lie, he in like manner uses his own previous discussion for his purpose of refuting them. His reasoning, therefore, is to this effect:—'If Jews and Greeks are equally sinners, then as regards justification by the law, the Jews have in no way the advantage over the Greeks.' 'But the former is true,' which he proves by two arguments. Of these the first is a testimony borrowed from the previous discussion:—"we have before brought the charge," that is, we have charged them, and shewn that they are liable to the charge.

10. "As it is written, There is none righteous, not even one,"—the second argument for the assumption, from the testimony of scripture, continued as far as verse 19.

19. "But we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are in the law." Under the term "law," the apostle here includes not only Moses, but also the Psalms and the Prophets, that is, the whole of the Old Testament; and he therefore denominates the testimonies adduced—'the sayings of the law.' In these words, therefore, the apostle proves that the testimonies which he has adduced out of the scriptures relate to the Jews, and convict them of sin: and, indeed, he does so proleptically, knowing that the Jews would make a different application of them. The proposition, 'Whatsoever things the law saith, it saith to all those who are in the law'—is given in the text, amplified by the adjunct of the common knowledge of Paul and the Jews. To this so obvious a proposition the apostle subjoins the no less manifest assumption:—

'But you Jews are in' or 'under the law:

'Therefore, contrary to what you think, the law utters these testimonies concerning you.'

The argument is from conjugates; for the words *νόμος* and *νομικοί*, or the equivalent expression, *οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ νόμῳ*, are conjugates. "That every mouth may be stopped, and the whole world become liable to the condemnation of God." He next

illustrates the foregoing and implied conclusion concerning the conviction of the Jews by the testimonies adduced out of the scriptures, from its twofold end: the first is,—'that every mouth may be stopped, not among the Gentiles only, but also among the Jews;' the second is,—'that the whole world may become liable to the condemnation of God, the Jews no less than the Greeks.' For while in the opinion of the Jews, it was beyond dispute that the Greeks and Gentiles were sinners, they were by no means disposed to admit that the same thing was true of themselves; as appears from Gal. ii. 15, where 'to be a Jew by nature' is opposed to 'being a sinner of the Gentiles:' the apostle therefore applies convincing testimonies from the scriptures to the Jews also, that, they too being self-convicted and brought in guilty, he may obtain the universal conclusion, 'that every man, both Jew and Greek, holds the truth of God in unrighteousness; and,' as he expresses it in Gal. iii. 22, 'is shut up under sin by the law.'

20. "Therefore from the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight." The reasoning in proof of the assumption of the first syllogism, which has been prosecuted from the 18th verse of chap. i. to this place, is here brought to a conclusion:—'the righteousness of man in the sight of God is not from the law, nor its deeds.' "For through the law is the knowledge of sin." We have here a new argument for the assumption which has just been concluded, taken from the contrary effect of the law which is to make known sin and misery:—

'Sin and unrighteousness became known by the law:'

'Therefore righteousness and salvation do not become known from the law, but from the other part of the word, namely, from the gospel.'

Thus the apostle here assigns to each part of the word its own and its proper effect: so that it is the office of the law to make known sin, and to threaten death as the consequence of sin: but of the gospel, to make manifest the remission of sins in Christ Jesus, unto righteousness and eternal life.

21. "But now, God's righteousness without the law has been manifested"—a Prolepsis in which he anticipates an objection suggested by the foregoing conclusion of the assumption. Sensual and natural men who were disposed to seek righteousness by the law, might say to the apostle:—"If, as you conclude, no flesh shall be justified by the works of the law, then you take away from man all righteousness in the sight of God, so that he can have no righteousness before God at all. The apostle replies—'that the proposition is false, and that our keeping of the law is not the sole ground of righteousness before God; but that God's righteousness—namely, that by which man is righteous before God—has been made manifest without the law.' By the manifestation here spoken of, the apostle means that full and complete revelation of righteousness which was made by Christ manifest in the flesh; and, accordingly, he illustrates it by the circumstance of the time:—'now, for the first time,' says the apostle, 'has it been made manifest, namely, by the gospel of Jesus Christ.' "Being proved by the testimony of the law and the prophets"—a second prolepsis of the Jews, ignorant as they were of the gospel:—'Whence does that righteousness of yours appear?' they might say to the apostle, 'or, how can it be proved?' To this he replies, that although it is without the law, yet it has the testimony both of the law and the prophets, and is proved thereby, as he shewed the Bereans, (Acts xvii. 11.) The testimony of the Law concerning the righteousness of faith is this:—'that all those who have kept the law are righteous;' to which the believer subjoins through faith:—'although I have broken the law, yet I have kept it in Christ:' whence the law testifies to the believer that he is righteous through faith. As regards the prophets, they preached Christ Jesus, and righteousness through faith on him.

22. "God's righteousness (I say) through faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all those who believe." With a view to the illustration of his two last replies, the apostle here defines that righteousness of God which he has spoken of as having been made

manifest without the law, yet proved by the testimony both of the law, and of the prophets;—'that righteousness,' says the apostle, 'is God's righteousness through faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all those who believe on him.' In this definition, there is first the genus:—'that righteousness of which I speak is really righteousness.' This he asserts against the sensual of his day, who thought (as do the Papists of our own day after them,) that all righteousness which is not from the law and our own works, is imaginary; in opposition to which the apostle says, that this righteousness which is without the law is really righteousness: this is the genus. Secondly, the characteristic or specific difference—whereby that righteousness which is without the law is shewn to be more excellent than that which is from the law, if any such there could be—is drawn from the principal efficient cause, the subject, and the instrumental efficient cause. The principal efficient cause of this righteousness of God, or righteousness by which we are righteous before God, is—"God;" wherefore the apostle calls it God's righteousness: and God effects it, 1st, by giving it, John iii. 16; 2d, by imputing it, Rom. iv. 5; 3d, by accepting it when imputed, Matt. xvii. 5. The subject of it is twofold. The primary, or subject in which the righteousness alluded to primarily resides, and that, by keeping the law fully, is—"Jesus Christ;" for he alone has procured by his obedience that righteousness whereby we are righteous before God: the secondary is—"all who believe," who become righteous by the imputation of his righteousness; and, accordingly, the apostle calls this righteousness ours, through Jesus Christ, thereby intimating, that the original possessor of this righteousness is Jesus Christ, and then, we through him. The primary subject then of this righteousness is Christ, who has it by his own keeping of the law; and after him believers, who have it by God's imputation, from him. This secondary subject the apostle expresses by the universal term "all," and that twice repeated, in order to set aside the distinction between Jews and Gentiles, as the words immediately following shew, and prove that the Gentiles were called to a participation in

the common grace, a thing which the Jews could hardly be induced to believe. The last particular is, the instrumental cause of this righteousness, which is faith, agreeing not to Christ the principal, but to us the subordinate subject. For Christ is righteous, not by faith, or another justifying him, but by keeping the law perfectly; whereas, we, on the contrary, who are secondarily righteous, become so, not by keeping the law, but through faith in a justifying Christ: the faith of Jesus Christ, therefore, is the instrumental cause of our righteousness. The exhibition of this righteousness by God, through the preaching of the gospel, and its reception through the operation of the Holy Spirit, when the gospel is heard, the apostle denotes by the prepositions "unto" and "upon;" for all righteousness is exhibited by the preaching of faith, and the same righteousness is upon all by the reception of faith, or of the gospel preached: Or these prepositions may be referred to those acts of God of which we have spoken; so that "unto"—a preposition of motion—may denote the giving and imputing, and "upon," the accepting of that righteousness. "For there is no distinction." These words assign the reason for the use of the universal term "all," and for its being twice repeated, as has been already remarked.

23. "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." He here proves what he has just affirmed, viz.:—that there is no distinction between Jews and Gentiles in respect of grace, but that righteousness is unto all and upon all those who believe, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, through the faith of Jesus Christ. The reasoning is from an effect already consummated to its end, as the apostle himself explains it in Gal. iii. 23:—

'All, both Jews and Gentiles, have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, that all of both classes may be justified freely:' or, as he speaks in the passage referred to,—"the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise from faith of Jesus Christ might be given to those that believe."

'Wherefore, the promise, or free justification through faith, is

common to all who believe, both Jews and Gentiles, without distinction.'

This already consummated effect is the fall into sin, with its consequences: whence, we may here observe, that according to the mind of the apostle, the common fall of all men, although in other respects pernicious, yet in respect of God, has been the medium of the accomplishment by Christ of the common salvation of all who believe.

24. "(That is,) by his grace." He next explains what it is to be justified freely, viz.:—'that it is to be justified purely from the grace of God, without any merit of our own.' "Through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ." In these words he pursues his explanation, and defines what it is to be justified by the grace of God, namely:—'that it is to be justified through the redemption which is in Jesus Christ,' so that the redemption which is in Christ is that grace by which we are justified freely, or justified by his grace without any merit of our own. Moreover, the apostle calls this redemption "grace," because, as we have said, it is freely given, freely imputed, and freely accepted. We must observe, however, that according to the apostle, our free justification is based upon redemption: *i.e.* we are justified in such a way, that although in respect of ourselves that justification is free, to the praise of the mercy and grace of God; yet it is at the same time from the redemption which is through the full satisfaction of Jesus Christ, to the praise alike of the justice of God.

25. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness through the remission of sins that are past." The apostle here proves each of the foregoing statements, viz.:—'that justification is free,' and 'that God is just in justifying us freely,' which together make up the sum of the gospel—by a description of Jesus Christ. The first part of the description is his "propitiation," illustrated by its author, "God," —"whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation;" by which I

understand the incarnation * of the Son of God, or his manifestation in the flesh. The second part is our reconciliation with God through his sacrifice in the flesh; for to be a propitiation is to be a propitiatory † sacrifice, propitiating God towards us sinners; and this is amplified by the instrumental cause whereby that sacrifice becomes ours for reconciliation, which is—"faith in his blood." The third part of the description is the end of each of the preceding—viz., of the incarnation and sacrifice in his flesh—which is the display of God's righteousness—"to declare his righteousness." By "God's righteousness" I understand here, as above, in verse 21, that righteousness whereby we are righteous in God's sight, which the apostle here defines by its form, as he has before defined it in verse 22, by its efficient cause and subject. Its form is "the remission of sins." These sins the apostle describes by their former reign in the world; for to be past here signifies that the world had lived in them, and that they had reigned in the world before Christ was known: so that the sense of the expression—"which are past" is—'in which the world walked, and which reigned in the world before Christ was manifested in the flesh;' as the apostle himself explains it in Acts xiv. 16, xvii. 30. What he says then is:—that the righteousness of all who believe on Jesus Christ, of the Jews first, and then of the Gentiles, consists in the remission of such sins as formerly reigned in the world, and still reign in the unbelieving world; and the remains of which, although they do not reign, because resisted through the Holy Spirit, are nevertheless still found even in believers themselves, as long as they continue in the present state. The apostle, therefore, lays down these two principles: first, that before Christ was manifested in the flesh, the Gentiles indulged in all sorts of sins, which in the passages above referred to he calls their "ways,"—'God suffered the Gentiles to walk in their own ways;' secondly, that to those who believe on the blood of Jesus Christ, the remission of all these sins, great and numerous as they are, is sure, which remission is our righteousness before the Lord.

* Ἔνσάρκωσιν. † Ἱλαστικὸν.

26. "From the forbearance of God." This is a prolepsis, wherein he anticipates an objection, by which the unbelieving, both among the Jews and among the Gentiles, endeavour to refute both of the principles which he has laid down, and to conclude that there were no such sins in the world before Christ was known, as the apostle here speaks of, and consequently that the righteousness of us who believe on Christ does not consist in their remission. Therefore they thus argue:—

'If the sins which are now remitted for righteousness to those who believe are past, then God, who is a just judge, would, in times past, have destroyed the world while still walking in sin;

'The latter, however, is false; he did not destroy them, but on the contrary "gave them good things, and filled their hearts with food and gladness," (as the apostle speaks, Acts xiv. 17):

'Therefore the former also is false,' and the world was neither unrighteous in times past, as you affirm, nor is now to be justified by the remission of sins.'

To this the apostle replies—that the proposition is false; and that although God, who is a just judge, did not destroy the world, yet sin reigned in the world without Christ, because God bore with the world even while sinning, and "endured," as he elsewhere speaks, with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath framed for destruction. "To declare at this time his righteousness." This last illustration of his reply, and of that forbearance of God whereby he long endured the sins of the world, is taken from its end, repeated from the preceding verse:—'it was not without design that God bore with the sins of the Gentiles even when sin reigned in them; but for this end, viz., that at the time of the manifestation of Jesus Christ he might show—*i. e.* make known to the world—his righteousness through faith in his Christ, or that righteousness whereby the world, otherwise dead in sins, might be justified in the sight of God:' 'because God,' the apostle means to say, 'was about at this time to exhibit this righteousness by the manifestation of Jesus Christ in the flesh, before this

time he had borne with the Gentiles, great sinners though they were, in order that that righteousness of his might be manifested in their posterity.' "That he might be just, and the justifier of him who is of the faith of Jesus." We have here the fourth and last part of the description of Jesus Christ, which was begun in the verse immediately preceding. It is drawn from the remote end [of his incarnation and sacrifice] which is the consistency and harmony of the justice and mercy of God in the justification of us sinners. For unless God were just as well as the justifier of us sinners in Jesus Christ set forth for a propitiation through faith in his blood, then neither we ourselves, nor any created being in our name, could make satisfaction for our sins: but Jesus Christ, having been set forth by the Father for a propitiation, has so fully satisfied divine justice for all the sins of all believers, that God, in justifying us who believe in Jesus, of his own pure grace and mercy, is himself also most just. One thing should be observed here, viz., that what the apostle, in these two verses, calls "his righteousness," is not—'that by which God is righteous in himself,' nor—'that by which he is declared righteous in executing judgment on wicked sinners,' but—'that whereby he freely treats us as righteous,' in other words—'the righteousness which is freely given by him in Christ, who alone has made satisfaction and earned righteousness (for us.)'

27. "Where is glorying then? It is excluded. Through what law? Of works? Nay; but through the law of faith." This is a winding up and conclusion drawn from the foregoing and already inferred conclusion of the principal assumption. That conclusion, as we have said above on verse 20, was—'that no flesh can be justified from the works of the law:' from which the apostle now deduces another conclusion, viz.,—'that all glorying is excluded through faith.' This he here discusses under the form of a dialogue, and by contraries; the substance being—'that all glorying in the flesh is excluded, not through the law of works, but through the law of faith.'

28. "We conclude, therefore, that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law." This is the conclusion of the first syllogism, as has been observed on the 18th verse of chapter 1.—'Therefore justification is from faith.'

29. "Is he the God of the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also."

This is a working out and explanation of the foregone conclusion, from the adjunct of the universality of its subject; for inasmuch as he has said that man is justified by faith, he shews that by "man" he intends the Greek, and whosoever of the Gentiles is of the faith of Christ, not less than the Jew and the Israelite; and this he proves by two arguments. Of these, the first is taken from the principal efficient cause of that righteousness which is common to Gentiles and Jews, namely, that God who is the self-same God of both. The apostle, therefore, thus argues:—'Of whomsoever God, namely, the one true God of the Israelites, is the God, to them also belongs God's righteousness; or all such are justified by faith without the works of the law.

'But he who is the God of the Jews is also the God of the Gentiles;'—which the apostle here proves in a dialogue with the Jews claiming God as their's alone—

'Therefore that righteousness of God which is without the works of the law, and from the faith of Jesus Christ, belongs equally to Jews and Gentiles.'

30. "Since it is one and the same God who shall justify the circumcision from faith, and the uncircumcision through faith." The second argument is taken from the effect of Him who is the God alike of Jews and Gentiles, which effect is to justify both; and the apostle thus reasons:—'God justifies both "the circumcision," that is the Jews or Israelites, and "the uncircumcision," or Gentiles.

'Therefore God's righteousness belongs to the Gentiles also; for both the Jew and the Greek are justified by faith.' In this

argument the apostle, with a view to confirm his conclusion, adds the expressions from faith, through faith, as an exposition or explanation of the effect of God in justifying Jews and Gentiles, the justification of both having this in common, that it is effected by *faith*. It will be observed that there is a distinction made between the two cases by the mode of speaking employed; for the apostle says that the circumcision, *i.e.* the Jews, are justified *from* faith, but that the Gentiles are justified *through* faith. This distinction I conceive is to be explained as follows:—First, the apostle intimates to the Jews 'that although they have the law, yet the matter* of righteousness in their case is not the law and the keeping of it, but that faith, or Christ apprehended by faith, is the matter of righteousness before God even to those who possess the law;' or, as he expresses it more plainly in Gal. ii. 16—"we also believe on Jesus Christ that we may be justified *from* the faith of Christ, and not from the works of the law," that is, 'that Christ, not the law, may be the matter of righteousness to us:' this is the one side of the distinction. As regards the other, when he says that the uncircumcision is justified *through* faith, he points out the form† through which righteousness becomes ours, and whereby Christ himself also is apprehended by faith; so that the meaning is—'As Christ, and not the keeping of the law is the matter of righteousness to the Jews who have the law, so the way to the same righteousness lies open even to the Gentiles themselves, who have not had the law, through the same Lord Jesus Christ apprehended by faith;' as was foreseen and predicted long before by Noah, when he blessed Japhet, Gen. ix. The apostle introduces this distinction here that the Jews may not deceive themselves by thinking, because they have the law and circumcision, that they will be justified from the law and circumcision; but that, carried beyond these, they may, through the same faith, lay hold of that righteousness which is common to them with the Gentiles, who could not hope for salvation from the law and circumcision, inasmuch as they had not the law.

* *i.e.*, Source or ground. † *i. e.*, Manner or medium.

We should here remark, in passing, the threefold form of expression employed by the apostle in reference to this subject; for he says that we are justified "by faith," "from faith," and "through faith:" of which formulæ the difference is, that the first denotes the *instrument*; the second the *matter*; and the third the *form* of our justification or righteousness. The term "faith," therefore, in the first, is used in its proper sense; but in the other two it is put by metonymy for 'Jesus Christ;' for we say that we are justified "*through* Christ," intimating the form, and that we are justified "*in* Christ," denoting the matter; but I do not remember that the apostle any where says that we are justified *by* Christ absolutely, and as the instrument.*

31. "Do we therefore make void the law through faith?"

This is a prolepsis, in which he anticipates an objection which might be brought forward by the Jews, charging the conclusion with detriment, as they formerly did the assumption. The objection is this:—

'If man is justified by faith, the law is rendered useless and abolished:

But the latter supposition is absurd.'

"Far from it." The apostle replies to the proposition first, by repelling it with abhorrence as an impious calumny—'far be it from us to abolish the law:' secondly, by reasoning from the greater to the less—'not only do we not render useless and abolish the law, but we shew its use and establish it.' For its use was to lead us to Christ, as the apostle speaks in Gal. iii. 24—'The law was our child-leader, pointing to Christ.' And it is established in Christ: first, by its fulfilment in his blood; for inasmuch as Christ therein fulfilled the law, he shewed that the law and all its ceremonies were

* That is, that the word 'Christ' is never found in such a connection *in the dative case*, which is the ordinary mode of expressing instrumentality in the Greek language, and which is the manner in which the word 'faith' is used in the first formula. This statement may appear to be overthrown by Acts xiii. 39; Rom. v. 9; and Gal. ii. 17; but these are only apparent exceptions, the literal rendering in those passages, respectively, being, 'in him' 'in his blood,' and 'in Christ.'—*Transl.*

useful "until the time of reformation:" Secondly, by the regeneration begun in us here, whereby even here we commence that obedience to the law which we shall fully yield in a future life; for in these two ways, viz., by its use and fulfilment, and the latter twofold, perfect in Jesus Christ, and begun in us, the righteousness of faith and the preaching thereof at length establish the law, by bringing about its fulfilment. The apostle therefore rejects that calumny concerning the law being rendered useless through the righteousness of faith, as directed not against himself, but against the truth of God. And thus far the first argument for the point in dispute, or for the righteousness of faith, has been prosecuted; as was stated under the 18th verse of chap. i.

CHAPTER IV.

In this chapter follows the second argument whereby the apostle proves that man is justified by faith, taken from the case of Abraham who was "the father of them that believe," and whose justification was to serve as a precedent in the case of all who were afterwards to be justified, and to his whole seed according to the spirit. The argument runs thus:—

'Abraham was not justified before God from the works of the law but by faith, and the imputation of the righteousness of faith:

'Therefore righteousness is from faith and not from the works of the law.'

The proof of the consequence is added:—

'It was written that Abraham was justified by the imputation of righteousness through faith, says the apostle, for our sakes, to whom it was afterwards to be imputed; that is, in order that we might know that we were in like manner to be justified by the imputation of the righteousness of faith:

'Therefore, if Abraham was justified by faith and not from the works of the law, righteousness is from faith and not from the law.' The antecedent of the argument is discussed from v. 1. to v. 16.; and the consequent thence to v. 23. The re-

maining verses are occupied with the proof of the consequence: or this may be viewed as the general proposition of a complete syllogism, if you prefer that form of argument, in this way:—

'The justification of Abraham was recorded as a precedent for our justification after him;' or more plainly—'in whatever manner Abraham was justified, in the same manner we, his posterity, according to the spirit, are also to be justified;

'But Abraham was not justified by works, but by faith: 'Therefore so are we also to be justified.'

The assumption occupies the first place, extending, as we have said, to v. 16; next comes the conclusion, thence to v. 23; lastly, the proposition from v. 23. to the end: and these are the three sections into which the chapter is divided. In the first section, containing the assumption, there are three sub-divisions: there is first the first part of the assumption, viz.—'that Abraham was not justified by works,' in vv. 1, 2; then follows the second part of the assumption, viz.—'that Abraham was justified by faith,' from v. 3 to v. 9; whence to v. 16, we are presented with an amplification of the same second part.

1. "What shall we say therefore that our father Abraham has found according to the flesh?" We have in these words the first part of the assumption—'According to the flesh, *i.e.* by his own works and the keeping of the law, Abraham found nothing as regarded righteousness in the sight of God.' This the apostle presses in an interrogative form, that it may be confirmed by the testimony, suffrage and concession of the Jews themselves, convinced by the evidence of the truth; as if he had said—'shall we say that Abraham found righteousness according to the flesh? I do not say so; neither can you.'

2. "For if Abraham were justified from works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." This is an illustration by contrast, of the first part of the assumption, in which the apostle prolleptically refutes an opinion commonly received among the Jews,

who perhaps perverted the authority of James in support of it,—that Abraham was justified by works. The apostle—agreeing with James, that Abraham was justified by works, and had whereof to glory, namely, because, as James says, he had offered his son upon the altar—replies,—'that nevertheless this glorying of Abraham was not before God, but before men:' that is—that by the effect of faith alluded to, his righteousness was proved, nay, that Abraham thereby outshone all men, and that it was a most manifest token of his being beloved of God; but that his justification before God rested on a very different and much more excellent righteousness than that of his own obedience and works, from which there is no glorying and no justification to any flesh, as the apostle speaks above, chap. iii. 30, and Gal. ii. 16.

3. "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness." This is the second part of the assumption, and the second subdivision of the first section of the chapter, viz.—'that Abraham was justified by faith;' which the apostle proves thus:—

'He to whom faith is imputed for righteousness is justified by faith;

'But Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness:

'Therefore he was justified by faith.'

The argument is taken from what equally follows in the case of relative opposites:—'God imputes or gives righteousness to Abraham from faith; therefore Abraham receives righteousness or is justified from faith.' The assumption is contained in this verse, proved by the authority of Scripture and the Divine testimony; Gen. xv. 6; Ps. cvi. 31.

4. "But to him that worketh the reward is not imputed from grace, but from debt." He here proves the proposition of the foregoing syllogism:—

'To him that worketh the reward is from debt;

'Therefore he to whom faith is imputed for righteousness.

worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, that is, he is justified by faith.'

The argument is drawn from what equally follows in the case of opposites: for 'to work,' or 'to acquire righteousness by works,' and that 'righteousness should be imputed from faith,' or 'given freely,' are opposites; and so are—'to be justified from debt,' or 'to receive a reward,' and 'to believe on him that justifieth the ungodly.' The antecedent of the enthymeme is contained in this verse, amplified by a contrast:—'To him that worketh, that is, to whom righteousness is imputed from works, it is given, not by grace, but from debt.'

5. "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is imputed for righteousness." We have in these words the consequent of the enthymeme, also amplified by the help of a contrast. It is to be observed that the attribute or predicate here stands first, and that the subject is put after it: for instead of saying, as he might have done—'he to whom faith is imputed for righteousness worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly,' (the inference, to wit, being drawn contrariwise), the apostle, having converted the statement, expresses himself as if the inference were direct, in contradictories; although, according to the mind and scope of the apostle, the inference should be contrariwise, from opposites, the order of the terms only being altered, by transposition, instead of saying, (as we have already remarked that he might have done) 'he to whom faith is imputed for righteousness,' &c. It should also be noticed that the expressions—"the reward is imputed from grace," and "believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly," or "his faith is imputed for righteousness," are here synonymous; as also 'that to him that worketh the reward is imputed from works,' and that "to him that worketh the reward is imputed from debt:" but that 'working,' and 'having one's faith imputed for righteousness;' also 'imputing from grace,' and imputing from debt,' are opposites.

6. "Even as David also declareth that man blessed unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." The second argument for the proposition is from the effect of justification before God, which is happiness or blessedness:

'Whosoever is blessed, the same is also righteous before God, and by whatever means he attains blessedness, by the same means he attains righteousness;

'But he to whom God imputes righteousness is blessed by faith without works:

'Therefore he to whom God imputes righteousness is righteous by faith without works.'

The assumption which is contained in this verse is established by the testimony of David, which is more fully presented out of Ps. xxxii. in the two following verses.

9. "Does this declaration of blessedness then apply to the circumcision only, or to the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness." This is the third subdivision of the first section of the chapter, and the amplification of the first assumption, from the adjunct of a twofold time: 'Abraham was justified by faith, or faith was imputed to him for righteousness, first of all in uncircumcision; and this justification of faith was subsequently confirmed, being ratified by the sign of circumcision. This amplification the apostle manages by anacœnosis;* for first of all a question is proposed in the beginning of the verse, and then at the close of the same verse he states the ground of the question, viz., the assumption which has just been concluded: as if he had said:—'since we have already concluded that faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, or that Abraham was justified and rendered blessed by faith, the question arises—'when was that imputation made, was it after he was circumcised, or while he was still in uncircumcision?'

10. "How was it then imputed? When he was in circumci-

* *i. e.* by consulting with his hearers or readers.

sion, or in uncircumcision?" As he had interrupted the question by interposing the ground of it he repeats it a second time, "Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision." This is a hypophora, or the subjoined reply, of which there are two parts. Of these the first consists is a contrast—'faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness, not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision.'

11. "And he received the sign of circumcision,"—the second part of the reply,—'circumcision followed the imputation of righteousness to Abraham as the sign of a righteousness previously received.—"A seal of the righteousness of faith." This is a definition of circumcision introduced by the way, upon which we may observe, that, according to the apostle, a sign or seal is a kind of sacrament. "That he might be the father of all that believe in uncircumcision that righteousness might be imputed to them also." We have next an illustration of the reply from its ends. First, from the end of the first part, and that twofold: the one end of the imputation of righteousness to Abraham in uncircumcision was—'that he might be the father of them that believe in uncircumcision;' the other, and ulterior end,—'that righteousness might be imputed to them also.'

12. "And the father of circumcision." Secondly, from the end of the latter part of the reply. 'Abraham, having been justified in uncircumcision, afterwards received the sign of circumcision that he might be the father of the circumcised;' for so the appellation, circumcision, is here used by metonymy of the adjunct for the subject. "(To wit) to those who are not only of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, which he had when in uncircumcision." This is an epanorthosis, in which the apostle corrects what he has just said, viz.—'that Abraham is the father of the circumcised,' by a contrast:—'Abraham is not the father of all who are circumcised; but of some,' whom the apostle here describes by a comparison of majo-

made with hands, but who are also circumcised in heart, and walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, to wit, that which he had when in uncircumcision.'

13. "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, came not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." We have here the reasons of the epanorthosis:—

'If all who were of the circumcision were also the seed of Abraham, and Abraham their father, then the promise to Abraham and to his seed, that he should be the heir of the world, would have come through the law and circumcision;

'But the latter is false:

'Therefore so is the former.'

The assumption is contained in this verse, illustrated by a contrast—'the promise came, not through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.'

14. "For if those who are of the law be heirs faith is made vain, and the promise rendered void." He proves the assumption and the first part of the contrast:—

'If the inheritance were from the law, the promise would be vain, and faith on the promise would be vain, because we would not obtain the promise;

'But the latter is false:

'Therefore the promise is not through the law.'

15. "For the law worketh wrath,"—the proof of the proposition from the effect of the law:—'The effect of the law is to work for us the wrath of God;

'Since therefore the law worketh wrath, if the promise had to be hoped for through the law our hope and faith in the promise would be vain,' for the wrath of God and the attainment of the promise are inconsistent and incompatible the one with the other. "For where no law is there is no transgression." He proves the ante-

cedent, viz.—'that the law worketh wrath,' from another and prior effect of the law:—'The law worketh transgression; Therefore it worketh wrath also.' The proof of the last antecedent is given in the text:—'Where there is no law, there is no transgression: 'Therefore the law worketh transgression.'

It must be observed, however, that both the effects here ascribed to the law, viz.—the transgression of the law, and the wrath of God ensuing thereupon, are accidental effects, and owing to the inability* of our flesh: for if we kept the law, the law would work neither wrath nor transgression; but since the law has been made, and we cannot keep it, it can work nothing else than wrath and transgression.

16. "Therefore the inheritance is from faith." Here commences the second section of the chap., containing the conclusion of the leading syllogism:—'Therefore we attain the inheritance of the heavenly kingdom, and consequently are justified—for the inheritance presupposes righteousness—from faith, and not from the works of the law.' "That it may be through grace." He illustrates the conclusion, viz. 'that our inheritance is from faith,' by its twofold end. Of these the first is that our inheritance may be gratuitous, or freely bestowed, which would not be the case if the inheritance were from the works of the law: for whatever any one attains from the works of the law, as the apostle has already said, he receives from debt, and consequently it is not gratuitous or freely bestowed; work and grace, or grace and debt being diametrically opposed to each other, as the apostle afterwards shews, xi. 6. Here let us observe, in passing, that the design of God from the beginning was to gain glory to himself from grace, or from the gratuitous salvation of men, and the free bestowal of the inheritance, for which end the apostle here says, the inheritance comes to men by faith; so that the sense of the words is:—'Our righteousness and life is through faith, for the accomplishment of the design of God from eternity, which was that we should be justified

* Ἀδυναμίαν.

rity, 'namely, those who are not circumcised by the circumcision and saved in Christ his son freely, or entirely through his grace, and not in the works of the law, through original or native righteousness.' "That the promise may be stable"—the second and ulterior end for which the inheritance is through grace:—'if it were through the law and its works it would be instable, although not on the part of God promising, yet on our part to whom the promise is made; nay more, through weakness and instability it would be without strength and unable* to be fulfilled, as the apostle shews, chap. viii. 3: in order, therefore, that the promise might be stable, and able to be fulfilled, nor hindered through the inability† of our flesh, it was the design of God that the promised inheritance should be through grace to the whole seed. This establishment and confirmation of the promise he illustrates by its subject which is the whole seed of Abraham, that is—"not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham." He explains the subject by an induction of its parts, of which two are here mentioned: the one of the law; the other of faith. These are amplified by a comparison of majority, thus:—'that the promise may be stable to the seed of Abraham, not only to that which is of the law, but also to that which is of the faith of Abraham:' whereby the apostle means to intimate, that unless the promise were from grace it would be stable to neither part of the seed; not to that which is of faith, because they would not have the law from which to attain the promise, nor yet to that which is of the law, because of the weakness of the law. By "the seed of the law," I here understand—'believers under the law;' and by "the seed of faith"—'those who from among the Gentiles are brought to the faith of Abraham,' which is deserving of attention for this reason, lest any one should suppose that any man, who is not a believer, can be of the spiritual seed of Abraham: for the whole seed of Abraham is of faith; but one part of faith only, viz., the believing Gentiles; the other of the law also, because of the oracles of the law having been committed to them, as

* Ἀδύνατος. † Ἀσθενείαν.

the apostle has already said.—"Who is the father of us all." This is a prolepsis in which he anticipates an objection of the Jews glorying in the law, and in Abraham as their father. 'God gave the law,' the Jews might object, 'to the whole seed of Abraham with whom he made the covenant; how is it then that you say, in your distribution of the seed, that besides the seed which is of the law, there is another seed of Abraham to whom the promise is made?' To this objection the apostle here replies, by asserting—'that Abraham is the father of us all, even of those who believe without the law.'

17. "According as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations." The reply is here proved by adducing the divine testimony from Gen. xvii. 5; where a seed is promised to Abraham, not only from among the Jews, and those who are under the law, but from among other, yea, even all nations: whence it follows, that he himself is the father of many, yea, of all nations; as it is said in Gen. xii. 3, or, according to the division of Tremellius, the last verse of chap. xi. "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." "Before that God whom he believed,"—an opening up and explanation of his preceding reply, from the adjunct of the manner,—'Abraham is the father of many nations, not, however, carnally, and in the flesh, but before God whom he believed, and in the Spirit.' The apostle, therefore, wishes to teach the Jews by this reply of his, that Abraham has another posterity, and another race, than that which they knew of: for they knew of no other offspring of Abraham than that which was according to the flesh; but the apostle here says that there is another before God, and in spirit, through the faith of Abraham, which, like Isaac, was born to Abraham by the power of the promise of God, as the apostle speaks more plainly in Gal. iv. 23, &c. 'To be a father before God,' therefore, here means to be a father by the power of the promise of God, and with respect to God promising: for *God* promised to Abraham that many nations would be his seed, and the *promise* was made concerning many nations who should be a seed to

Abraham. In this twofold respect, Abraham was made the father of many nations, viz., by believing, and by laying hold on the promise through faith; so that this seed of many nations from Abraham, is of the nations by believing, and born to him by the power of God promising. "Who quickeneth the dead, and calleth the things that are not as though they were." We have in these words a description of that God who made promise to Abraham, and whom Abraham believed, from his effects, by which the power of his promise is shown, and by which he himself is distinguished from all the false gods in which the Gentiles had believed. The effects here mentioned are two; the first is 'the quickening of the dead in sin,' (Eph. ii. 1.) our regeneration being so called by synecdoche of the part for the whole; the second is the calling of the Gentiles, whereby 'those who were not a people,' as Hosea speaks, 'are called the people of the living God.' The former of these effects, therefore, is common; for all, both Jews and Gentiles, are "dead in sins," as the apostle shows at large in Eph. ii. The other is peculiar to the Gentiles, according to the explanation of the apostle, chap. ix. verses 24, 25, 26, of this epistle; where, quoting from the prophet, he compares the calling of the Gentiles with the first creation of all things: for just as in it God first called into existence things that were not, and they were; so God calls the Gentiles, who previously were not a people, and, by his calling, they become the people of the living God.

18. "Who (viz., Abraham) against hope believed in hope, that he should become the father of many nations." As in the preceding words he has described the God whom Abraham believed, so in these the apostle describes the faith by which he believed God: first, from the adjunct of its difficulty—he believed "against hope;" secondly, from the adjunct of its firmness—he believed "in hope;" thirdly, from its material cause—he believed "that he should become the father of many nations;" and he explains the several parts of the description in the words that follow: "According to that which had been said (unto him) so shall thy seed

be." He begins with the last, namely, the subject matter of his faith, which is here explained by its efficient cause, viz., the promise of God, adduced from Gen. xv. 5—"So shall thy seed be."

19. "And being by no means weak in faith." The apostle prosecutes the two remaining parts of the description, first, by enumerating the difficulties, and then by explaining the strength of his faith in overcoming these difficulties. "He considered not his own body now dead." The difficulties are two. The first is 'the deadness of his own body.' The apostle employs the term, "dead," (*νενεκρωμένον*), to denote the effect next to death, and because his body, although still endued with life, was yet no better than a dead body, as regarded the generation of offspring. "When he was about an hundred years old." In these words he establishes the first difficulty from the adjunct of the old age of Abraham, and his time of life unfit for generation. He was a hundred years old, not, indeed, before the promise was made, but before he obtained the promise which had been made to him in his seventieth year; whence the apostle says, in Gal. iii. 17, that the promise preceded the law by 430 years. "Nor yet the deadness of Sarah's womb." The second difficulty was, 'the deadness of Sarah's womb.'

20. "This promise of God he did not dispute through unbelief, but strengthened himself." Next comes 'the strength of his faith,' which is explained by three illustrations:—The first illustration is by a contrast—'Although such hindrances stood in the way, Abraham did not dispute against the promise, but strengthened himself in faith against hindrances and unbelief,' under which contrast there is concealed a tacit comparison of majority: 'he not only did not distrust, but did not even dispute the promise through unbelief.' "Giving glory to God." The second illustration of the strength of his faith is taken from its effect: 'believing against hindrances, he glorified God as true;' and here the apostle teaches us, in passing, that our giving glory to God increases and diminishes with our faith on God; referring to Numb. xx. 12, where God says

it to the charge of the unbelief of Moses, that he had not 'sanctified' or glorified him before the people of Israel.

21. "And being fully persuaded." The third illustration is drawn from the formal cause of his strong faith, which is 'his full persuasion,' (πληροφορία), 'Abraham was fully persuaded,' (πεπληροφορημένος), therefore he was strong in faith. "That what he had promised he was able also to perform." He explains the full persuasion * of Abraham by its efficient cause, viz., 'the omnipotence of God to perform whatever he promises;' and this was the grand cause (αἴτιον αἰτιώτατον) of his strong faith. Abraham was strong in faith to believe God, because God was strong to perform to Abraham whatever he had promised.

22. "Wherefore also it was imputed to him for righteousness." The apostle here makes a transition to the third section of the chapter, by repeating the assumption of the syllogism, which was argued at large in the first section, and is here deduced as a corollary from the strong faith of Abraham, which has just been explained—'because Abraham believed God, and that firmly, therefore faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness,' 23, 24. "Moreover, it was written not for his sake only, that it was imputed to him,

"*But* for the sake of us also, to whom it shall be imputed." Here commences the third section of the chapter, and the proposition of the leading syllogism, or, if you prefer it, the proof of the leading proposition, amplified by a comparison of majority. 'The manner of Abraham's justification has been recorded, that it was by faith, not for his sake only, but for the sake of us also;' that is, it is not merely historical, but also for our imitation and learning, to teach us that we also are to be justified in the same way in which Abraham was justified,' which is the proposition of the leading syllogism. The proof is from the end; "for the sake of us," —"namely, to those who believe,"—a restriction of the general

* πληροφορίαν.

term, "us," as if the apostle had said, 'When I say for the sake of *us*, I do not mean either *all us men*, or *all us Jews*, but only those who believe, whether of the Jews, or of any other nation whatever.' By this restriction, therefore, the apostle both describes those for whose sake the justification of Abraham has been recorded, by the adjunct of their faith, and repeats the conclusion of the leading syllogism—'that our justification, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, is by believing.' "On him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." In these words the apostle explains justifying faith by its object, and the manner in which it apprehends its object. The object is 'God,' whom the apostle sets forth by a description from his effect—'He raised up Jesus Christ the Lord from the dead.' The manner of apprehending him is, first, 'to know that he is mine,' and then 'to cleave to him,' both of which are here indicated by the familiar expression of the apostle, "our;" for the three formulae, "I believe that God is," "I believe God," and "I believe on God," differ in this way, that the first and second belong to historical faith, and signify the three following things:—1*st*, 'That God is;' 2*dly*, 'That he is such as he is described in the word,' (for this is to believe that God is); 3*dly*, 'That every word of God is true,' (for this is to believe God): but "to believe on God" belongs to justifying faith, and in addition to the three things just mentioned, signifies these two besides:—1*st*, 'That this God who is described in the word, and is such as he is therein described, is mine;' *i. e.*, 'that he is mine according to all his attributes in the word,' or 'that he is my God for blessing and salvation;' 2*dly*, That I so rest in this my God, that I cleave to him with my whole heart. "To believe on God," therefore, is, *first*, 'to believe that God is;' *secondly*, 'That he is such as he is described in the word;' *thirdly*, 'That every word of his is true;' *fourthly*, 'that he is my God, and that I am his;' and lastly, 'that I rest in him, or cleave to him, with my whole heart:' and this is the true way of apprehending God.

25. "Who was delivered (to death) because of our offences, and

raised up for our justification." This is a description of Jesus our Lord, who was raised up from the dead, from two adjuncts: the first is—'the delivering of him to death,' which is put by synecdoche for his whole passion; the second—'the raising of him again from the dead,' which, in like manner, is put by synecdoche for his whole glorification, as it is expressed in the gospel and creed. Each of these adjuncts of Christ is illustrated, separately, by its end. His death was—'because of our sins;' that is, Christ died, that by dying he might make full satisfaction for all the sins of us who believe. His resurrection again was for our justification; that is, Christ was raised from the dead that he might be able to apply to us the ransom, * and redemption price which he procured by his death: for if he had himself had remained under the power of death, the ransom procured by his dying would not have availed us for righteousness and life; but having died for us, and being alive again, he applies the price of his death for righteousness and life to us. In this description of Christ there is contained a third argument in proof of the leading conclusion, viz., our justification by faith; to which the apostle makes a transition by the foregoing description of God from his operation, in v. 24. immediately preceding. This argument is apodictical † and is taken from the first or necessary and the proximate cause of our justification and life, viz.—'the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.' The syllogism of this argument, which is made up of reciprocal propositions throughout, is as follows:—

'All who are justified and attain the inheritance, by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, are justified and live, not by works, but by faith on him who died and rose again,' or, as the apostle speaks, 'on him who raised up Christ from the dead; But all of us who are partakers of life and righteousness are justified through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,' (which assumption is implied in the words of the apostle in the text—"who was delivered, &c.") that is—'being washed from our sins through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, we are justi-

* Lutron. † Demonstrative.

fied:' whence follows the conclusion—'that we are justified and live by faith.'

CHAPTER V.

1. "Therefore being justified from faith, we have peace towards God." This chapter may be divided into three sections; in the first of which, extending as far as verse 12, we have a commendation of justification from faith; the second, from verse 12 onwards to the 20th contains the conclusion of the foregoing discussion, viz.—that men are justified, not every one by his own works, but all by a common faith on one who justifies many, namely, Jesus Christ, the second Adam; the third section consists of the last two verses of the chapter, and in it we have the commencement of the refutation.

To return to the first section; the commendation of justification from faith is taken from its effects, and may be said to constitute a fourth argument in support of that doctrine, in this way.

'Whatever is followed by peace with God, restoration into his grace, and glorying in the hope of the glory of God, that is the true justification of man before God:—

'But this peace, restoration and glorying follow, not the justification of the law but the justification of faith:—

'Therefore it is justification from faith by which we are justified before God.'

The proposition, as being sufficiently obvious, is omitted. The assumption is given in ver. 1 and 2, and contains the said commendation of the righteousness of faith, which is founded upon three of its effects. Of these that which is second in order is, by hysterosis, put first; and that which is first in order occupies the second place: since our restoration into grace or our reconciliation with God is prior to our peace towards God. For "peace towards God," as I here understand it, is the whole effect of our

reconciliation, and the blessed condition of those only who are reconciled, and born of God: whether therefore it be peace of conscience, or that freedom of speech* before God which is the privilege of sonship, or that reconciliation with the creatures, of which Isaiah speaks in chapter xi. and lxv., I conceive all this, and the happiness of men therein, to be included under the name of "peace towards God" in this place. It is called peace "towards God," inasmuch as the whole of it arises from our peace with God: for it is because there is peace between us and God that conscience is pacified, that the creatures are at peace with us and that we have peace in life: and in this sense Christ employs the term in John xvi. 33, opposing it to all the disquietude which we may have from the world and in the world. "Through our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle illustrates this our peace towards God by its efficient cause, which is our Lord Jesus Christ: He it is who procures that peace for us, and it is through him that we enjoy it; as he himself says in the passage before referred to—"in me ye shall have peace."

2. "Through whom also we have had access by faith into this grace, whereby we stand." This is the second effect of justification from faith, but prior in order to our peace with God, as has been already remarked, viz.:—'our restoration into grace, or reconciliation with God:' for our reconciliation is our restoration into that grace or free favour with God, from which we fell by sinning against him; and this free favour or grace is the foundation of that new peace, which flows to us from the mercy of God, that is, of the blessed condition which our merciful God confers upon us already reconciled and again received into grace, as the same apostle teaches us in the commencement of each of his epistles, comprising all the blessings which he supplicates from God for us, at one time under "grace, mercy, and peace," at another time under "grace and peace," viz. 'that peace which flows from mercy.' This our reconciliation or restoration into

* Παῤῥησίαν.

grace with our God is here illustrated by its principal efficient cause, namely—"our Lord Jesus Christ," through whom we have this access into grace; by its instrumental efficient cause, viz.—"faith;" and finally, by its effect, which is—to "stand" or 'persevere therein.' From this we may learn, in passing, that the perseverance of the saints is the proper and inseparable effect of their reconciliation through Christ; so that having once been reconciled and received again into grace through our Lord Jesus Christ, they can never afterwards fall from that grace either entirely or finally, as our Lord himself teaches us in John xiii. 1, —"having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them unto the end." "And glory in hope of the glory of God." The third effect of justification from faith, or, if you please, and perhaps more correctly, the second effect of reconciliation, springing from reconciliation itself and the consciousness of perseverance with which it is accompanied, is—'the glorying of the saints.' This glorying is here illustrated by its proximate cause, viz.—"the hope of the glory of God," that is of the glory which is laid up for the saints, and which is hid with God in Jesus Christ; of which glorying you may see an example in chap. viii. of this epistle, verses 33, 34, 35, with its foundation and cause, verse 38. The analysis which is here presented of the causes of our blessedness and peace with God is worthy of our attention: the first is—justification by faith in Jesus Christ: the second—the reconciliation through Christ of those who are justified; hence perseverance, and the hope of the glory of God; and from these peace and glorying therein.

3. "And not only so, but we even glory in tribulations." He next amplifies the glorying of hope by a comparison of majority: —'we glory not only in hope of the glory of God, but even in tribulations;' that is—the tribulations of the saints and the things which they suffer, because of their hope, from the world and in the world, do not diminish their glorying in this hope, but are, as it were, the instrumental causes of increasing it, or, as others under-

stand the passage—'are the subject-matter of glorying the more intensely:' Of these two explanations, however, I prefer the former, because in the words immediately following, as well as in Heb. xii. 11, the production of joy is ascribed to sufferings, "knowing that tribulation worketh endurance:

4. "And endurance, experience; and experience, hope:" The apostle here gives a reason for the apodosis,* and why we should glory in tribulations. The argument is presented under the form of a prosyllogism:—

'Tribulation works hope:

Therefore we ought to glory, not only in hope, but even in tribulations.'

The antecedent is proved:—

'Experience of the divine deliverance works hope;

'But affliction works experience of the divine deliverance.'

The latter is proved from the *causa sine qua non*,† or *causa per accidens*:‡—

'The endurance of afflictions works experience of the divine deliverance'—for how shall any one experience the divine deliverance who has not endured afflictions?

'But tribulation or oppression from the world, and in the world, works endurance,' which the apostle proves by our own knowledge and testimony:

As a conclusion from which the antecedent follows,—'that tribulation from the world works hope.'

5. "And hope putteth not to shame." By hysterosis, he next establishes the protasis,§ viz., 'that the hope of the saints pro-

* Consequent clause of a hypothetical proposition.

† Indispensable condition.

‡ Accidental cause.

§ The conditional clause of a hypothetical proposition. N.B.—The terms protasis and apodosis are also used in a wider sense, for the first and second members of a period, whenever these are connected by a conjunction indicating a certain relation between them.

duces glorying.' The argument which he adduces is taken from the disparate,—'hope putteth not to shame;' or if you please, and perhaps more correctly, from the immediate contrary of Christian glorying; for the apostle here puts 'glorying' and 'being put to shame' in direct opposition, so that the negation of the one involves the affirmation of the other. He therefore reasons thus:—

'Christian hope does not put us to shame;

'Therefore we Christians glory in hope.'

"Because the love of God is shed forth in our hearts." This is the proof of the antecedent, viz.—'that our hope does not put us to shame', deduced from the adjunct of 'the abundance of its certainty, and of a sense of the love of God in the gospel,' indicated by the term "shed forth:"*—

'The love of God is shed forth in our hearts;

'Therefore our hope does not put us to shame.'

To the same purpose the prophet speaks in Ps. xi. 7; and the apostle himself, further on, when he says, chap. viii. 31, "If God be for us, who is against us?" By "the love of God" I understood here that affection wherewith God loves and encompasses us, which is just that grace into which we are restored in our reconciliation through our Lord Jesus Christ: the same cause therefore, is here assigned for the Christian not being put to shame, as has before been assigned for his glorying in hope: with this difference, that what is there styled "grace," and here termed "love" is amplified by the adjunct of its abundance, indicated as has been already remarked by the term "shed-forth." This 'shedding forth' of the love of God I take to be that same 'full persuasion' which we have seen in Abraham, chap. iv. 21; whence it appears that we must maintain with the apostle that justifying faith is not *head* knowledge merely, but also a feeling 'shed forth in our *hearts* by the Holy Spirit who is given unto us.'

He illustrates this love of God by the efficient cause of its shedding forth, which is—'the Holy Spirit;' and the Holy Spirit again is illustrated by the efficient cause of his dwelling within us, viz.,

* Ἐκκέχυται.

'because he is the gift of God in Christ Jesus.' The apostle hereby teaches us this lesson, that by the same grace and love of God into which we are restored through Jesus Christ, his Holy Spirit being given to us works in us both knowledge and feeling, which the apostle here calls—'a shedding forth in our hearts.'

6. "For Christ, when we were yet without strength, in his own time died for the ungodly." We have next the proof of the love of God, thus shed forth and superabounding, from its effect in giving up to death for us our Lord Jesus Christ in whom he loves us, and in whom we are reconciled. This death the apostle here variously amplifies. First, from the voluntary offer whereby Jesus Christ gave himself up to death; as our Lord teaches us, John x. 18, and which the apostle here intimates when he says that "Christ died," that is—'was given up to death by the Father, and voluntarily gave up himself to death.' Secondly, from the adjunct of the time, and that twofold: first, in respect of ourselves—'when we were yet without strength'; next in respect of himself—'when his own time came,' "the full time," and "the time predetermined by the father," as the apostle says, Gal. iv. 4. From this adjunct of the time the apostle would have us learn our inability without Christ, and that in the matter of salvation we have no strength, until new strength is imparted to us through the death of Christ; not indeed that we may procure salvation thereby, but that those for whom salvation has already been procured in Christ may walk in the way of salvation, and may do so more and more every day as that strength shall increase. Thirdly, that death is amplified from its end—"for the ungodly" says the apostle, that is—'that he might deliver us from ungodliness and the death due thereunto.' Or it may be said, and perhaps more correctly, that this third amplification of the death of Christ is taken from the adjunct of the ungodliness of us for whom he died: the sense of the words will then be—'when Christ died for us we were only ungodly;' and the syllogism of the proof will be as follows:—

'The love of God superabounds towards those, or he sheds forth

his love upon those, for whom, when they were only ungodly, Christ died;

'But we are those for whom, when they were ungodly, Christ died.

'Wherefore the love of God is shed forth upon us, and his love towards us superabounds.'

The assumption is contained in this verse being expressed in the words last quoted.

7. "Scarcely indeed for a righteous man will one die." In place of the proposition itself we have here the proof of it, by reasoning from the less to the greater:—'Scarcely will one die for a righteous man;'

'Therefore his love abounds who dies for an ungodly man.'

"For perhaps some one may dare to die for a good man." This is an epanorthosis of the foregoing argument from the less, and the reason why the apostle has added the particle "scarcely" in his proof of the proposition, viz., because it may happen, although it can rarely occur, that some one may die for a man who is both righteous and useful.

8. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." This is the conclusion of the syllogism with a repetition of the assumption: for 'to commend the love of God to us' here is—'to display it shed forth upon us.' In these words the two following things are affirmed: first—'that God has shed forth his love upon us and commended it above all the affection of all creatures,' which is the conclusion of the preceding syllogism; secondly—'that God did this and manifested his immeasurable love, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us sinners,' which is the assumption of the same syllogism.

9. "Therefore, being justified by his blood, much more shall we now be saved from wrath through him." This is the second argument by which he proves that hope does not put to shame, taken from the less:—

'Those who, having been formerly unrighteous, are justified through the blood of Christ, being now justified, shall much more be saved through that blood from the wrath to come;

'But we, having been formerly unrighteous, are now justified through the blood of Christ;

'Wherefore, much more shall we be saved through the same blood from the wrath to come.'

The apostle here uses the expressions—'not to be disappointed or put to shame by one's hope,' and—'to be saved from the wrath to come,' as synonymous: for our preservation from that wrath is the thing hoped for: and those who obtain it are not put to shame by their hope.

10. "For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son; much more being reconciled, we shall be saved through his life." This is a third argument for the same, also from the less:—

'Those who, having been formerly enemies, are reconciled to God through the death of his Son, shall much more be saved through his life;

'But we, having formerly been enemies, have been reconciled to God through the death of his Son;

'Much more therefore, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved through his resurrection and life.' Here 'reconciliation through death' as the less, is compared with 'salvation through life,' as the greater; in the same way as 'the justification of the unrighteous,' and 'the salvation of those already justified,' are compared in the preceding verse.

11. "And not only so, but we also glory in God through our Lord Jesus Christ." We have here an illustration of the last conclusion from the greater: it is—'our glorying in the meantime in God, as ours by covenant, and in ourselves as his people, until we attain salvation through the life of his Son.' This glorying is here illustrated by its efficient cause, viz., 'our Lord Jesus Christ;'

for as his life works out salvation for us, so it is through him that we glory in salvation until we attain it. "Through whom we have now attained the reconciliation." He illustrates this effect of Christ in working out glorying for us, by a similar previous effect of the same Lord Jesus Christ, which was—'to work out reconciliation for us.'

12. "Therefore, as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin." We come now to the conclusion of the point in dispute, and of the principal question which has been discussed from the 18th verse of chap. i. to this place, viz.—that that righteousness by which man is justified in the sight of God, is through one man Jesus Christ (the same who is God-man),* apprehended by faith. This conclusion is here variously amplified, by a twofold comparison between Christ and Adam; whence Christ is called "the second Adam," or, as the apostle speaks in 1st Cor. xv. 47, "the second man."

The first comparison is one of similarity, which is stated in two ways: 1st, Explained by its parts; 2d, Abridged. The protasis of the explained similitude is contained in these words, "through one man," that is, 'the first man,' or, 'Adam,' "sin and death entered into the world." The apodosis, which is understood, runs thus:—'So through one man, namely, the second man, or, Jesus Christ, was righteousness, and life through righteousness came to the world.' "And so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned." An illustration of the protasis from the adjunct of the universality of sin, and of death because of sin:—'death has come upon all men, because all have sinned.' For whether you understand this of individual men of the race of Adam singly, or of all men in Adam jointly, taken either way, it is an universal truth—'that all have become subject to death, because all have become subject to sin:' for all sinned and died in Adam, and all since Adam sin and die, except Christ, the second Adam, who alone being without sin in himself, died for our sins.

* Θεάνθρωπος.

13. "For until the law, sin was in the world." This is a prolepsis, whereby he anticipates an objection of the Jews, excusing sin by carnal reasoning, or, if you prefer it, of the sensual and natural man acquitting the first age of the world on the ground of the want of the law, thus:—

'Where there is no law there is no sin;

'But there was no law in the world until Moses; for the law was ordained through Moses:

'Therefore, there was no sin in the world from Adam to Moses; and what you teach, viz.,—that all have sinned, is not true.' To this objection, the apostle replies, that there were both law and sin in the world before Moses: accordingly, he first proves that there was law, and then that there was sin. He proves that there was law in the world, because there was sin, and so turns the reasoning of the objectors against themselves, thus:—'Where there is sin, there is law;

'But there was sin in the world before Moses and the law ordained by him:

'Therefore, there was also law before the law which was ordained by Moses.'

The assumption is given first. "But it is considered that there is no sin where there is no law." This is the proof of the proposition, viz.—'that where there is sin, there is law.' The argument is taken from what equally follows in the case of relative opposites; for if it is considered that there is no sin where there is no law, it follows, that where there is sin, there is also law, because, of a truth, "sin is the transgression of the law."

14. "But death reigned from Adam until Moses." He here proves the assumption of the last syllogism, viz.—'that there was sin in the world before the time of Moses.' The argument is drawn from the effect and wages of sin, which are death:—

'There was death from Adam to Moses:

'Therefore there was also sin.'

For as there is no sin where there is no law, so there is no death

where there is no sin. Wherefore, if all from Adam to Moses were under death, all from Adam to Moses were also under sin.

Here it is worthy of remark that the apostle does not simply say that 'there *was* death' but that "death *reigned* from Adam to Moses;" he thereby intimates that the prevalence of death in the world attracted observation because all died, but that the prevalence of sin in men was less noticed until the law was ordained anew by Moses; but that after the law was ordained, the reign of death ceased, and the reign of sin began, because the power of sin was observed by men, and because it was a just thing with God that they should die. The same thing is taught by the apostle in chap. vii. 9 of this epistle:—"Without the law sin was dead," *i.e.* 'was not seen to reign,' "and I was alive," or 'I seemed to myself worthy of life; so that it was from the tyranny and reign of death that I died:' "But when the commandment came," that is 'after the law was ordained,' "sin revived," or 'the reign of sin attracted my observation,' "and I died," or 'I seemed in my own judgment worthy of death;' so that after the law had been ordained through Moses, it was not death but sin that tyrannized and reigned. Hence also the apostle elsewhere says that the law slew him until having become dead to the law, Christ raised him again, to live unto God, under the reign of grace or "the kingdom of God and of heaven." The apostle thus divides the duration of the world into three *reigns:* the reign of *death* from Adam to Moses; the reign of *sin* from the law to Christ, as he speaks, chap. vi. 12; and the reign of *grace* from Christ for ever, which in Rev. xii. 10, is called the kingdom of God and the power of his Christ. "Even over them who have not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression." He goes on to illustrate the assumption of the last syllogism, viz., 'that death had reigned from Adam to Moses,' by a comparison of majority:—'death reigned not only over those who sinned actually, as did Adam, but even over those who could not sin in like manner, on account of their age, as infants unconscious of the law.' By this the apostle would teach us that the law, the transgression of which is sin, reaches

farther than to the actions, and that corruption of nature itself is a transgression of it: otherwise it would be unjust that infants who cannot sin actually should die. "Who is a type of him that was to come," that is—'Adam was a type of Christ,' only, however, in the respect already mentioned, that as sin and death come through Adam, so do righteousness and eternal life come through Jesus Christ: and this is the abridged similitude, and the second way of stating the comparison.

15. "But not as the offence, so also (is) that which (God) freely bestows." The second comparison by which the apostle illustrates the leading conclusion is one of dissimilarity, and is twofold. The first dissimilitude is between the fall and grace—'not as the fall so also is that which God freely bestows.' By "the fall," he means the first actual sin of Adam: "grace," or "that which God freely bestows," is explained by the apostle himself in the words immediately following to be the donation or "gift of God," (as Christ speaks, John iv.) whereby, through the grace of God, the one man Jesus Christ is given to us and unto death on our account. "For if by the fall of the one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and for that is' (as appears from what has already been remarked—that this grace of God is explained by the words that follow, therefore, I take the particle "and" here to signify 'that is') the gift by grace which is of the one man Jesus Christ hath abounded unto many." This is the proof of the foregoing dissimilitude from a comparison of inequality between the fall and grace, or Jesus Christ given by grace:—

'Grace is much more effectual to constitute many righteous than was the fall to involve them in sin;

'Therefore not as the fall, so also is grace.'

16. "For not as that which entered through one that sinned (so is) the benefit." The second dissimilitude is between the effects of the fall and of grace, which are twofold: the first; and those arising out of the first. The first effects are guilt and the

remission of sins. The apostle calls the guilt—"that which entered through one that sinned," and the remission—"the benefit, or, as he afterwards speaks—'that which God freely bestows through that One who made satisfaction for sin.' From this we should observe that according to the mind of the apostle, as that one man Jesus Christ is the free gift of God, and that which God freely bestows, so also is the remission of sins, and whatever God confers on us in Christ, a free gift, so far as we are concerned and in respect to us, although in respect to Christ it is a reward. "For the guilt indeed is from one (offence) unto condemnation; but that which (God) freely bestows is from many offences unto justification." We have next the proof of the second dissimilitude, which like the effects (as already remarked) is twofold. The first proof is:—'The guilt is from one fall or sin, but the remission is of many, yea, of all sins, in the case of those who believe:—

'Therefore not as the guilt or that which entered through one that sinned, so is the remission or benefit which God freely bestows in Christ.'

Each side of the comparison is amplified by its end: the end of the guilt is 'condemnation;' but of the benefit from many sins, or the remission of sins—'our justification;' for our sins are remitted in order that we may be justified.

17. "For if by one offence death reigned through one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life through one, Christ Jesus." This is the second proof of the second dissimilitude, from the secondary effects of the fall and of grace, which are 'death,' and 'eternal life' or 'reigning with Christ in life eternal.' This argument like the former is from a comparison of minority:—

'If through one fall death reigned through one, or through the fall of one man, much more those who receive superabounding grace shall reign in life through one, Jesus Christ:

'But the former is manifest;

'Therefore so is the latter.'

'Wherefore not as that which entered through one that sinned, so also is the benefit.'

18. "Therefore, as through one offence guilt came upon all men to condemnation, so through one righteousness the benefit hath abounded unto all men unto justification of life." This is the summing up, wherein, after having proleptically introduced a comparison of dissimilarity, he returns to a comparison of similarity between Christ and Adam, and that twofold, each being fully explained by its parts. In the first of these similitudes he compares in similar respects the transgression,* or unlawful deed of Adam, and his first actual sin, with the righteousness † of Christ, and his full satisfaction of the law: for so I understand the term δικαίωμα here, as 'the righteous deed of Christ, whereby he not only met the requirements of the law, but also fully satisfied the law for the transgressions of us who believe on him.' This righteousness of Christ he compares with the sin and first transgression of Adam in the similarity of their like effects:—'As by the fall guilt came upon all men, so by the righteousness of Christ the benefit of the remission of sins has abounded unto all;' the similarity of these effects being—'that as that guilt was to condemnation, so that benefit of the righteousness of Christ was to the justification (εἰς δικαίωσιν) of those who are in him.'

19. "For as through the disobedience of one man many were constituted sinners, so through the obedience of one shall many be constituted righteous." This is the second similitude between Christ and Adam, whose disobedience is compared with the obedience of Jesus Christ in their respective effects:—'through the disobedience of Adam many were constituted sinners, so through the obedience of Christ shall many be constituted righteous.' The passage may be thus explained; or, if you prefer it, it may be said that from verse 12 to this place we have a fifth argument for the righteousness of faith, from a comparison of similarity with

* Παράπτωμα. † Δικαίωμα.

Adam, given in verses 12, 13, 14, this similitude being made up of various comparisons of minority, in which are shewn:—the greater efficacy of grace for the remission of sins than of the original fall for guilt, in verse 15; again of remission for justification, than of that guilt for condemnation, in verse 16; and, lastly, of justification for the reign of life, than of condemnation from the guilt of that fall for the reign of death, verse 17; and from these various comparisons of minority the similitude is again deduced in two parts, in verses 18 and 19.

20. "Moreover the law entered that the offence might be augmented." This may be said to be an illustration of the last apodosis, from the greater, in this way:—'by the entrance of the law, the fall and disobedience of one, namely, of Adam, was augmented; yet, through the obedience of one, grace superabounded that many might be constituted righteous. I prefer, however, to view it as the commencement of the *destructive reasoning*, and *refutation* of objections against the truth which has been already established by the apostle from the 18th verse of chapter i. up to this place. As, therefore, we have had a course of constructive reasoning by which the doctrine of righteousness through faith has been established, so we have next the destructive reasoning by which the objections against the truth already established are refuted. The objections of those arguing for the law against faith are various. The first objection is concerning the use of the law, and is suggested by the last conclusion:—

'If the righteousness of many is through the obedience of one, the law, which was prior to the gospel, was ordained to no purpose;

'But the latter is not true:

'Therefore righteousness is not through the obedience of one, nor the inheritance through faith on the promise, as has been affirmed.'

The apostle replies to the proposition of the objection in the words before us; and his reply consists of two parts. The first

part is,—'that the Mosaic law,' for it is that which is here in question, 'was not prior to the promise and this righteousness through the obedience of one; but that it entered besides (παρεισῆλθε) and came after the promise of God concerning righteousness through faith;' for so the apostle himself explains it in Gal. iii. 17, where he shews that the law was posterior to the promise by 430 years. The second part of the reply is—'that the use of the law entering besides was, that the fall might be augmented; or that sin, which entered into the world through the disobedience of one, might increase:' whence it follows, that neither is righteousness through the law, nor yet was the law ordained to no purpose and without its use, since it was ordained, after the promise of the gospel, not to take away, but to augment sin. This use of the law, you will understand as accidental, and with respect to us who are carnal and under sin, to such a degree that not only are we unable to keep the law, but sin and that first transgression of one, taking advantage of the law, is augmented; and thus the world, which came under sin by the fall of one man, sins still more, and multiplies transgression by reason of the law entering. How is it that sin is augmented by the entrance of the law? In three ways. 1. By knowledge; for sin, which before the law entered, lay hid from view as if dead, and with respect to our ignorance of it had no existence, as soon as the law enters becomes known, is seen to exist, and perceived to live within us, so that we die. 2. Sin is augmented in consequence of the law entering, by our contempt of the law; for he who sins knowingly against the law, sins more heinously, inasmuch as to the sinful act he unites contempt of the known law: hence our Lord says—'that the servant who knows his Lord's will and yet transgresses, is to be beaten by his Lord with many stripes,' as being a greater sinner, on account of his contempt for that will which he knew. 3. Sin is augmented by the entrance of the law, because our corrupt nature, being curbed by the law, rushes with greater precipitation and more readily into sin; as it is said—"We strive after

that which is forbidden."* "But where sin was augmented there grace did superabound." This is an epanorthosis for the consolation of believers:—'that although, by the entrance of the law, sin is augmented, they are not to be cast down on that account, because sin, augmented though it be by the entrance of the law, shall not prevail over grace, which superabounds the more that sin is augmented and abounds.'

21. "That as sin hath reigned unto death, so also might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." He illustrates this superabundance of grace by its end, viz.—'the reign of grace,' which the apostle here variously amplifies. 1. He amplifies it by comparing it with 'the reign of sin,' illustrated by its end, which is 'death.' 2. By the adjunct of the manner—"through righteousness," which you must understand to mean 'the righteousness of faith,' or 'that righteousness whereby we are justified;' for, as the apostle has previously said, 'God commendeth his love toward us, and the reign of grace in this, that Christ suffered for the unrighteous in order that they might be justified.' 3. This reign of grace is illustrated by its end, which is 'eternal life.' 4. Jesus Christ is pointed out as the efficient cause, both of this eternal life and of the reign of grace itself. Observe here again what I formerly shewed concerning the three reigns into which the duration of the world is divided; for, besides 'the reign of death' of which he has spoken before, the apostle here makes mention of 'the reign of sin,' and 'the reign of grace.'

CHAPTER VI.

1. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may be augmented the more?" This is a prolepsis, by which

* Nitimur in vetitum [semper, cupimusque negata].—Ovid.

an objection arising from the preceding epanorthosis is anticipated :—

'If grace superabounds where sin is augmented, we must continue in sin that grace may thence the more abound;

'But you, Paul, assert, that where sin is augmented grace superabounds:

'Therefore we who believe on Christ must continue in sin that grace may thence be augmented the more.'

This conclusion, as being manifestly absurd, the opponents do not venture to draw, and, therefore, instead of stating it directly, they put it in the form of a question, insinuating both that the conclusion follows from the apostle's teaching, and that the doctrine of the righteousness of faith leaves us at full liberty to indulge in every vice.

2. "Far from it." To this question the apostle returns a twofold reply. First, he repudiates the conclusion of the objectors, as impious:—'far be it from us who believe in Christ to continue in sin; and far be it from me to say or to teach this, or that it should be capable of being deduced from what I teach.' "How shall we, that are dead unto sin, live any longer therein." This is the apostle's second reply to the question, whereby he proves that the believer on Christ must not continue in sin. The first argument is from privative opposites:—

'Those who are dead to sin should not live in sin;

'But we are dead to sin:

'Therefore we should not live in sin.'

The assumption and conclusion are contained in the words quoted. Upon these words observe first, that 'to live in sin' and 'to continue in sin' are synonymous, and that 'to die unto sin' is the opposite of both. Observe again that the sin here in question is the remaining corruption of our nature after Christ is known and the new life is begun: for those who are born again are only partially regenerated during the present life, so that the remains of original corruption—which the apostle, in Gal. v. 17, denominates

"the flesh" in opposition to "the spirit"—survive in them even till death. The question concerning this remnant of the flesh is—'should we continue in it, or live therein?' That is—'ought a Christian man to indulge in the works of the flesh, or those sins which proceed from remaining corruption, in order that the grace of God may be the more illustriously displayed by their remission in Christ?' The answer of the apostle is 'by no means: for we are dead to the flesh through Jesus Christ, that we should not walk in the works thereof.'

3. "Know ye not that so many of us as have been baptised into Jesus Christ, have been baptised into his death?" He here proves the assumption immediately preceding, viz.—'that we are dead unto sin:'—'As many as have been baptised into the death of Christ are dead to sin;

'But as many as have been baptised into Christ, have been baptised into his death:

'Therefore all who have been baptised into Christ and believe on him, are dead to sin.'

The assumption is given in the text, and for the proof of it the apostle appeals to the consciousness of the Romans themselves:—"Know ye not?" as if he had said—"you cannot but know that.' 'To be baptised into Jesus Christ' here is—'to be washed by baptism for a sign or public profession and protestation before the world that we have become partakers of Christ and of his grace through faith.' 'To be baptised unto his death,' again, is—'to profess by baptism, or the reception of baptism, that we are dead with him, by participation in his death;' that is—'that through the spirit of God procured for us by Christ's death, our old man, or the corruption of our nature, has been crucified with Jesus Christ:' whence we may see that all who have been baptised into the death of Christ are also dead to sin, since their old man has been crucified with Christ.

4. "Therefore we are buried along with him, through baptism,

into death." This is the conclusion of the last, as it was also the assumption of the leading syllogism, viz.—'that we are dead to sin.' This death is 'illustrated by its principal efficient cause, Jesus Christ, and by his death—'we are buried with him into death,' *i. e.*, 'buried by the power and efficacy of his death;' because, as has been stated, the Holy Spirit, who mortifies us to sin, with Christ, is procured for us by the death of Christ. Then by its instrumental cause—"through baptism;" for baptism, just as the whole ministration of the word and sacraments, is not only a sign, but, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, is the instrument to believers of producing mortification in them. It must be remarked, however, that the apostle does not say—we are 'dead,' but "buried" with him; whereby he would teach us that we are dead to sin in such a way, that we ought to die more and more every day: for burial is the continued progress of death begun. "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead to the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in a new life." This is a third illustration of our burial with Christ, taken from its end, which end is 'to walk in a new life;' that is, as the apostle speaks in Eph. iv. 1,—'to walk worthy of the calling wherewith we are called,' or—'to live in a manner worthy of the gospel.' This, the end of our spiritual burial, is here illustrated by a similitude:—As Christ was raised up from the dead to the glory of the Father: so we, having been buried to sin and raised again to newness of life, ought to walk in that new life.' Our first resurrection, or resurrection to a new life, is here compared by the apostle to the resurrection of Christ, not on account of their similarity merely, but because the resurrection of Christ is the efficient cause of our resurrection to a new life; inasmuch as Christ when he rose again, and ascended to heaven, sent down the Spirit by whom we are renewed, as he promised to do, John xvi. Notice again here, that our spiritual mortification, or that mortification whereby we become dead to sin, has reference to our walk in a new life; whence it follows that besides the mortification of sin, which goes before and resembles burial, there is another part of our regeneration, viz., the raising again or

quickening of us to a new life. Observe here, thirdly, that our new life is not a life of idleness; for the apostle says that we must "walk in this new life." And, in the fourth place, observe that this walk is the glory of the Christian in that life; for as the apostle compares our new life to the resurrection of Christ, so he compares this our walking in a new life to the glory of the Father, to which Christ ascended.

5. "For if being planted, we have been joined with him in conformity to his death, we shall also be joined with him in conformity to his resurrection." He here proves the proposition of the leading syllogism, viz.—'that those who are dead to sin should not continue in sin.' The syllogism of the apostle is made up throughout of hypothetical propositions, in this way:—

'If we have been joined with Christ in conformity to his resurrection, or, which is the same thing, if we have risen again with Christ, we must not continue in sin;

'But if we have been joined with him in conformity to his death or in other words are dead and buried with him (which has been already proved,) we are also joined with him in conformity to his resurrection:

'Therefore if we are planted with Christ in conformity to his death, that is, if we are dead with Christ to sin, we must not continue in sin.'

The argument is deduced from the adjunct of the inseparableness of our quickening through Christ and our mortification through the same; which quickening is so contrary to perseverance in sin that the two are inconsistent, and the one being affirmed, the other is necessarily denied.

6. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him that the body of sin may be deprived of strength, that henceforth we may not serve sin." The assumption of the last syllogism, or the connection between our quickening and mortification through Christ, of which we were hearing in the last verse, is here proved

from the end of our mortification or crucifixion with Christ. This end is twofold: the first is—'that the body of sin may be destroyed;' the second—'that we may no longer serve sin:' "our old man, says the apostle, is crucified with Christ, that the body of sin may be destroyed, that henceforth we may not serve sin." The expression—"old man" is used by the apostle to denote 'our nature is so far as we are old, and bear the image of the first Adam,' that is in so far as we are corrupt, so that "our old man" is 'our corrupt nature,' or 'the corruption of our nature;' and it is denominated "the old man" in respect of "the new creature," or the subsequent sanctification of our nature through Christ the second Adam, which is styled our "new" and "inward man:" the expression—"body of death" I regard as put for the same thing. The meaning of the apostle's words therefore is—'that the corruption of our nature is crucified with Christ, and destroyed.' Moreover our old man or the body of sin is said to be "crucified with Christ" in two ways; first in Christ crucified himself; and then in ourselves: in *him*; because like our other sins, it was imputed to him and along with "the hand-writing of ordinances which was contrary to us" was fastened by him to his cross, that it might not be an obstacle in the way of our life; and in *us*, whilst by his spirit, which he procured for us on the cross, he slays our corruption, that being raised again we may live unto God. Concerning the latter mode of crucifying, the apostle appeals to our own knowledge, as concerning things of which a Christian man ought not to be ignorant.

7, 8. "For he that is dead is free from sin." This is the proposition of the leading syllogism:—'he, therefore, who is dead to sin, is truly set free from sin, that he may not continue in sin,' or 'under its dominion,' as the apostle afterwards speaks. Or if you prefer to understand these words of Christ, and ἀποθανὼν of him as dead, or "the first-born of the dead," this will be a third argument for the proposition, from the effect of the death of Christ, which is—the complete liberation from sin, both of himself as our

surety, and, in him, of us, for whom he stood surety; so that the sense of the words will be:—'he who is dead, viz., Christ, he who suffered for sin in his own death and passion is most justly liberated (δεδικαίωται) from all sin and guilt and the power of sin; from which the apostle deduces the proposition in the words that follow v. 8.—"If we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him." In these words you will observe that the apostle not only speaks of the new life of Christians in the present world, but also extends the promise of life in Christ, by a comparison of majority, to the life everlasting in the world to come.

9. "Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death (I say) hath no more dominion over him." He goes on to prove what he has just said, viz., that we, being dead with Christ, live with him not only here in newness of life, but for ever. The argument runs this:—

'Those who live to die no more, so that death shall no more have dominion over them, live not only here in newness of life, but for ever:

'But we, being dead with Christ, are raised again to die no more:

'Therefore we not only live here, but shall live for ever.'

The assumption is proved in the words quoted:—

'Christ is risen from the dead to die no more, death shall no more have dominion over him'—which the apostle illustrates by our own testimony, or by the adjunct of our knowledge:

'Therefore neither shall we, who are risen with him, die any more.'

10. "For in that he died unto sin, he died once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God." The apostle here proves the foregoing antecedent, from a comparison of dissimilarity between the death and life of Jesus Christ: which are compared in respect to two things, viz., their object and duration:—

'He died unto sin, and he died once: but he lives unto God, and consequently for ever:

'Therefore he is risen to die, or to be subjected to the dominion of death, no more.'

When the apostle here speaks of *Christ* as 'dying to sin,' we must not understand him as meaning the same thing as when we speak of *our* dying to sin. When we are said to die to sin, it is presupposed that we have once lived to sin: but Christ, who never lived to sin, is yet said 'to die to sin,' when by his death and passion he is liberated and set free from his suretyship for sin; the ransom * price due for sin having now been fully paid by his death and passion. For as we, until liberated through Christ, live to sin, and are under its dominion; so the Lord Jesus Christ, until by his death he discharged the debt which we owed, was under a load of sin, as our surety: wherefore, although he "knew no sin," yet by catachresis,† and in a certain sense, he may be said 'to have lived to sin,' until set free from that load of sin which he paid for us; and 'to have died to sin,' when he paid the price, and destroyed sin for himself and his people.

11. "So do ye conclude that you yourselves also are dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The proposition having been now established, he repeats the assumption—'that we are dead to sin;' and along with it the conclusion—that we are alive, no longer unto sin, but unto God: both of these he leaves us to conclude for ourselves from what has gone before; illustrating them, however, by their efficient cause, viz.—'Our Lord Jesus Christ,' through whom we both die unto sin, and live unto God to die no more.

12. "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body." This is an inference, and further conclusion deduced from the foregoing reply to the objection; in which the apostle lays down a twofold rule for Christians. The first part of the rule is—'Let not sin reign in your body:' by this the apostle would intimate, that

* λύτρον.

† Using a word in a sense very remote from its proper signification.

whilst we are in this world, our body is a body of sin and death, and will not be without sin so long as we continue here; nevertheless, he admonishes us not to allow it to reign. "That ye should obey it," viz., 'sin,' "in the lusts thereof," viz., 'of the body.' This is an epexegesis,* whereby he explains his rule, and what it is for sin to reign in our body, viz.—'that the obedience which we render to sin in fulfilling the lusts of the body, proves the reign of sin therein;' as our Lord also teaches us in John viii. 34, when he says—"Whoso committeth sin is the servant of sin," and the apostle further on, in verse 16.

13. "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." This is the second part of the rule prescribed by the apostle, which is illustrated by a contrast, and by its efficient cause, namely—'life from death,' that is—the new life from death in sin.

14. "For sin shall not have dominion over you." We have here the reason of the rule prescribed, and why sin should not reign in Christians:—

'The cause being removed, the effect should be removed:

'But the dominion of sin which is the cause of its reign in the world, is removed from you:

'Let not sin therefore reign in you.' "For ye are not under the law, but under grace." This is the proof of the assumption, from the removal of the dominion of the law, which is the cause of the dominion of sin:

'All those, over whom sin has dominion, are under the dominion of the law;' or thus:—'Sin shall not have dominion over any who are not under the law;'—because, as the apostle says in 1 Cor. xv. 56, "the strength of sin is the law;" for as 'there is no sin

* Opening up, or detailed explanation.

where there is no law,' so 'by the coming of the law sin is augmented, and when the commandment enters, sin revives, (c. vii. 9.) also, "by the law is the knowledge of sin," (c. iii. 20.)

'But you are not under the law:

'Therefore, neither has sin dominion over you.'

The assumption is illustrated by a contrast:—"Ye are not under the law, but under grace;" that is—'ye have been translated into the kingdom of grace, through Jesus Christ, who has fulfilled the law.'

15. "What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law but under grace?" We have next the anticipation of an objection suggested by the last assumption, to which the apostle replies from this place to the end of the chapter; and that in two ways. First, by rejecting with abhorrence such an abuse of grace and freedom from the dominion of the law—"far from it." For we ought not to transgress the law because the Lord has freed us from the law; but inasmuch as he has bestowed upon us grace, we should endeavour to live unto him who gave us grace; to take occasion, therefore, from the removal of the law's dominion, and the bestowal of grace, to transgress the law, is a detestable abuse of grace, and unbecoming in those who are its children; the apostle accordingly expresses his abhorrence at the thought.

16. "Know ye not that to whom ye yield yourselves servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey." This is the second part of the reply, by which he proves, that we must not sin because we are under grace and not under the law. The arguments are three. The first is taken from the adjunct of the servile condition of sinners:—

'All who sin are the servants of sin;

'But you who are under grace, and not under the law, are not the servants of sin:

'Therefore, you who are not under the law, but under grace should not sin.'

The proposition is first of all illustrated by distribution of its parts, and each part in the distribution by its end:—"to whom ye yield yourselves servants unto obedience, his servants ye are, either of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness;" in proof of which, he plies them with their own testimony—'Do you not know this?'

17. "But thanks be to God, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine into which ye were delivered."

18. "And being made free from sin, ye have been made over unto righteousness." The assumption of the syllogism is next variously amplified: first, from their former condition when under sin,—"ye were the servants of sin;" then, from the adjunct of the change effected in their condition by the Gospel—"ye have obeyed that form of doctrine into which ye were delivered," (these two being put in contrast with each other); thirdly, from the adjunct of the giving of thanks for the blessed change which they had experienced; and, lastly, it is illustrated from the contrary—"being made free from sin, ye have been made over unto righteousness."

19. "I speak after the manner of men, because of the weakness of your flesh." This is an epanorthosis, in which he corrects the phraseology which he has just made use of, in saying that those who are "under grace are made over unto righteousness," since, on the contrary, they are set at liberty to serve God; and he lays the blame of this catachresis on their weakness, as the occasion of it; for, as they would not understand him expressing heavenly things in the language of heaven, he is compelled, in teaching them, to employ these similitudes of servitude and liberty, borrowed from the intercourse of men.—"For as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness, and iniquity unto iniquity, even so now yield your members servants to righteousness

unto holiness." In these words we have the conclusion of the syllogism, viz., 'that those who are under grace should not sin,' illustrated by a comparison of similarity with their previous conduct, both the protasis and apodosis of which are illustrated by their end.

20. "For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness." This is the second argument for the reply, from what equally follows on the contrary supposition—'When you were the servants of sin, you were free from righteousness:

'Therefore, now that through grace you are become the servants of righteousness, be free, and abstain from sin.'

21. "What fruit had ye then in those things of which ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death." The third argument by which the apostle proves that the children of grace must not sin, is taken from the effects or fruits of sin, which are 'disgrace' or 'shame,' and 'death;' and he reasons thus—

'Those things from which there is no fruit in the doing of them, and which are afterwards followed by disgrace and death, should not be done:

'But, oh you who are under grace! whilst you sinned you had no fruit from your sins,'—here the apostle appeals to their own consciousness—"What fruit had ye then?"—'and now they are followed by disgrace or shame'—"of which ye are now ashamed"—'and death awaits those who persist in them'—"the end of these things," says the apostle, "is death:"

'Therefore, those who are under grace should not sin.'

22. "But now, being made free from sin, and made over unto God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end eternal life." He now illustrates the foregoing assumption by a contrast:—'Whilst you sinned, you had no fruit, but now, in serving God you have fruit; your sins were followed by shame; but now the service of God is followed by holiness; the end of sin is death,

but of holiness eternal life.' From these things the apostle would infer, that the children of grace must not only abstain from sin, but also live holily: and the argument for this may be said to be from the contrary effects of contrary causes. The contrary causes are, 'to live unto sin,' and 'to live unto God:' the effects of the former, 'ignominy' and 'death:' of the latter, 'holiness' or 'glory;' for holiness is glory begun, and 'eternal life.' To 'live unto holiness,' is 'to live to the increase and perfection of our sanctification;' for the more holily any one conducts himself, the more he increases and delights in holiness, since the Holy Spirit is cherished by holy conduct; and the end is eternal life. Hence the apostle thus reasons:—

'Those things ought to be done which are followed by much fruit, with holiness and eternal life;

'But, from the obedience which we render to God, there results much fruit, with holiness and eternal life;

'Therefore, those who are under grace ought to live holily and obey God.'

23. "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord." These two ends, viz., 'death,' which he has affirmed to be the end of sin, and 'eternal life,' which he has affirmed to be the end of obedience, the apostle here illustrates by a comparison of dissimilarity, shewing that, although eternal life and death are both ends, they are not ends in a similar sense: for that death is the end of sin, as its wages and just recompense (ἀντιμισθίαν); but eternal life the end of our obedience, not as a merit or recompence,* but as a free gift in Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAPTER VII.

1. "Know ye not, brethren, for I speak to those who are skilled in the law, that the law hath dominion over a man so long as he

* Ἀντιμισθίαν.

liveth?" The apostle having refuted the objection of the libertines, who sought to abuse Christian liberty as an occasion to the flesh, returns to the assumption contained in the fourteenth verse of the last chapter—"but ye are not under the law," and establishes it in the first section of this chapter, as far as verse 7. The syllogism by which he proves it runs thus:—

'Those who are dead to the law are no longer under the law, or the dominion of the law;

'But we who are dead and risen with Christ are dead to the law:

'Therefore we who are dead and risen in Christ, are no longer under the dominion of the law.'

The proposition of this syllogism is proved in the words cited, or in the first verse of the chapter:—

'The law has dominion over a man so long as he lives;

'Therefore, those who are dead to the law are not under the law and its dominion.'

This proof of the proposition, forasmuch as it is deduced from the law, the apostle especially adapts to the Jews, as being skilled in the law, and appeals to their own consciousness in regard to its validity—"Know ye not?" addressing them, however, affectionately, and as brethren.

2. "For a woman who is subject to a husband is bound by the law to her husband while he liveth; but if her husband be dead, she is freed from the law of her husband." He proves the antecedent from the law, the particular law which is adduced being that of marriage; accordingly he reasons from the law of carnal marriage to spiritual marriage, and draws his argument from a comparison of similarity:—

'A husband has dominion over a woman, who is subject to a husband, so long as he himself lives:

'Therefore the law has dominion over us only while we live under the law:'

For although the terms of the similitude, so far as it has yet

gone, are uttered in the apodosis, and our death put for the death of the law; yet the similitude from the law holds good, because a marriage is dissolved by the death of either of the parties.

3. "So then, if, while her husband liveth she become another man's she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law, so that she is no adulteress, though she become another man's." In these words he proves the protasis—'that a woman is subject to her husband only while he lives,' and reasons from the effect of the law of matrimony, illustrating this effect by a contrast:—

'She is an adulteress, and is so called, if she become another's, while her husband is alive; but if her husband be previously dead, she neither is nor is called an adulteress:

'Therefore she is subject to her husband only while he lives.'

4. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law,"—which is the assumption of the leading syllogism—"in the body of Christ." The apostle says 'that we are dead to the law in the body of Christ'—first, because we die to the law with Christ; secondly, because Christ died in the body only; and thirdly, because we are in a manner crucified with the crucified body of Christ, inasmuch as his crucified body was a ransom for all: so that by his one death we are all set free from and dead to the law and sin. "That ye should become another's." The assumption is next illustrated by its twofold end: the first is—'that we may become another's than the law's, viz.,—"his who is risen from the dead;" the second end is an epexegesis of the first—"that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

5. "For when we were in the flesh, the sinful affections, which were through the law, prevailed in our members, to bring forth fruit unto death." This is an illustration of the latter fruit or end, from a comparison of similarity; of which comparison the protasis is—'when we were under the law we brought forth fruit

unto death. The protasis is illustrated by its causes: the one is —'the flesh,' or 'our corrupt nature;' the other—'the sinful affections,' or 'motions of sin in our members prevailing through the provoking of the flesh.'

6. "But now we are free from the law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." We have here the conclusion of the leading syllogism and apodosis of the last similitude—'We are not under the law.' This is illustrated, *1st*, by its cause, which is—'the mortification of sin, whereby we are held under the dominion of the law;' *2dly*, by the adjunct of the manner, set forth in a way of contrast—"in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter."

7. "What shall we say therefore? Is the law sin?" Thus far we have had three objections touching the use of the law, and the first division of the refutation, from the 20th verse of chap. v. up to this place. Next comes the second division of the refutation, relating to the essence of the law, in which the topic discussed is, —'whether the law of God be in itself essentially evil and sin—or rather that sin sinful—and itself the origin of all sin and death:' this constitutes the second section of the chapter, and the second principal objection relating to the law. This objection like the last is not directly deduced, but instead of stating it in the form of a conclusion it is turned into a question,—'Is the law sin?' by which, however, it is implied, that the conclusion itself,—'the law is sin'—is a consequence from what the apostle has been previously teaching,—"Far from it." The reply to this second objection follows, consisting of three parts. First, he replies by expressing his abhorrence of such blasphemy, and denying the consequence—'far be it that so blasphemous an assertion should follow from my teaching, as that the law of God is either evil or sin.' For so, I take it, the expression—"far from it," is here to be understood, as if he had said—'far be it from us to say;' for he refers to that

which goes before—"What shall we say therefore?"—'Shall we say that according to your teaching the law is sin?' "far from it," answers the apostle. "Nay, I did not know sin, except through the law." The second part of the reply is a simple negation—'the law is not sin;' which, in these words, the apostle proves from the effect of the law, which is—'to make sin known.' Under 'the knowledge of sin' I conceive two things to be here included:—(1.) The difference between it and other things; (2.) Its own essential malignity and deformity; so that 'to know sin' is both 'to know what is sin, and what is not sin,' or 'to distinguish in things what are, and what are not sins;' and also 'to know that sin is in itself evil.' The apostle, therefore, thus argues:—'That by which sin becomes known and is known to us, is not itself sin; for sin becomes known through the rule of right and wrong, although that rule can never be itself sin;

'But sin becomes known through the law'—which the apostle here amplifies by a comparison of majority—'not only did I know sin through the law, but, what is more, I did not know sin *except* through the law:

'Therefore, the law itself is not sin.' "For I had not known lust, except the law had said—Thou shalt not covet." The assumption of this syllogism, and apodosis of the foregoing comparison, viz.—'that sin is not known except through the law,' the apostle proves by an example or specimen, which is—the transgression of the tenth commandment, or 'covetousness.' That it holds good of this sin, the apostle takes for granted, as known by experience from all the writings and sayings of all who have either written or taught on the subject of sin, by none of whom has it been said or written of covetousness that it is a sin: and hence, he thus reasons:—

'Unless the law of God'—*i. e.* the law received and given by Moses—'had said, "Thou shalt not covet," I should not have known from the sayings of others, that covetousness was a sin:

'Therefore, not only is sin known from the law, but it is not known except through the law.' Sin is here said to be "known,"

when it is explained and thoroughly taught, so that it may be understood; of which knowledge, as before remarked, there are two parts, viz.—'what it is,' and 'that it is an evil.' Both of these parts, the *natural* philosophers and sensual men reached in a measure, but not one of them ever fully explained: as the apostle shews by this example of covetousness, adduced from the law, which none of the wise men or philosophers of this world knew to be either a sin or an evil: for the philosophers knew something of the inward motions and depraved lusts which James calls 'the conceiving of sin;' but of the impure and covetous fountain of covetousness, that is—the ruin of our nature, and of the flesh coveting against the spirit, the philosophers neither possessed nor imparted any knowledge; the law of God having first disclosed this impure fountain to men. Under the name of "lust," therefore, I here understand, not merely 'those impure motions and internal sins,' of which the sensual man sees little, but also, 'that corruption of our nature which is prior to these motions and the source of them,' of which man by nature never so much as dreamed.

8. "But sin, taking occasion, wrought in me, through the commandment, all manner of lust." The foregoing conclusion is here illustrated by a contrast—'the law is not sin, but sin itself is sin, by occasion of the law.' To understand this contrast, know, in the first place, that the meaning of the above conclusion—'the law is not sin,'—is—'that the law is not the cause of sin,' or 'that the law does not work or produce sin;' as appears from the other member of the contrast, where instead of saying—'sin is lust,' as he might have done, the apostle says—"Sin worketh lust." Again, you must know, that "sin" in the latter member of the contrast means—'both original sin, and that sin sinful, as well actually in the first man, as naturally and inherently from him in each of his posterity:' for both of these are concerned in the production of subsequent sins. And, thirdly, Know that the term "lust" is here used by synecdoche for 'every sin that arises from original sin." The meaning of the contrast, therefore, is this:—

'the law of God does not work, or is not the cause of any sin; but that which causes and works every sin which arises in men is the first sin or original sin;' in other words, 'every sin flows from original sin, and that by occasion of the law.' How original sin produces subsequent sins by occasion of the law, has been before explained under the 20th verse of chap. v., and is explained more at large by the apostle in what immediately follows.

9. "For without the law sin (indeed) was dead. Moreover, I was alive without the law: but when the commandment came, sin (likewise) revived, and I died;

10. "And the commandment which (was ordained) for life, was found to be for death unto me." In these verses, and the 11th, the apostle proves the latter member of the contrast, viz.—'that sin, or every sort of lust, is produced in us, by sin, through occasion of the law of God:' for the first member of the foregoing contrast denied the fact—'that the law produced sin;' but the second affirmed the manner of the fact, viz.—'that original sin wrought every sort of sin in us, by taking occasion from the law.' The apostle proves that the manner is such as he has affirmed, or 'that sin is produced by sin through occasion of the law,' by an argument drawn from the similar manner of another effect of the same cause:—

'Original sin works death to me, or slays me, through the commandment, or through occasion of the law:

'Therefore original sin works in me every sort of sin through occasion of the law.'

The truth of the consequence rests upon this axiom:—that of two necessary effects which are similarly produced, in whatever manner the one is produced, the other is produced in the same manner. 'But every subsequent sin is the necessary effect of original sin, and death is the necessary effect of both; also the dependence of these two effects upon their causes is similar: hence the apostle thus argues here:—

'In whatever manner sin sinful works death, in the same manner it also works in us every sort of lust or subsequent sin:

'But original sin works death to us by taking occasion from the law:'

'Therefore it also works subsequent sins, or those sins to which it gives rise, by taking occasion from the law.'

The assumption of this syllogism or antecedent of the above enthymeme is proved by the apostle in these two verses, and the following one: the argument by which he proves it is taken from a comparison of dissimilarity between our condition before the law, and after the law has been exhibited to us, and understood by us; and is to the following effect:—

'Before the commandment came, that is before the law had been exhibited to me or was known by me, I was alive, and sin was dead; but when the law came, sin revived, and I died:'

'Therefore sins work death in me by occasion of the law.' The antecedent is contained in verse 9; the consequent is given in verse 11, being illustrated in the 10th verse, by contrast with the end of the law, which is 'life'—'the law was given for life; yet by occasion of the law, which was given for life, death was wrought to me.'

12. "So that the law (itself) indeed is holy: and the commandment holy, and just, and good."

This is the third part of the reply which commenced at verse 7, and in which the apostle meets the objection, touching the law, that it is sin. To that objection he here replies, in the third place, by a contrary affirmation, in which he claims for the law—holiness in precept, righteousness in the practice of its precepts, and good or happiness for its end; and asserts that these three things follow from his teaching, in as much as he has shewn in the foregoing discussion, that sin does not proceed from the law, but that every sin arises from sin by occasion of the law, which itself is not sin. The whole reply of the apostle to the objection may therefore be summed up as follows:—'Far be it that it should follow from my

111580

teaching that the law is sin; for I teach and affirm that it is not sin, but pure therefrom in precept, practice, and end.'

13. "Is then that which is good become death unto me?" This is an urging and prosecution of the second objection regarding the law—'that it is essentially and intrinsically evil;' or, if you like better, the second branch of that objection: for as there are two kinds of evil—culpable evil, which is 'sin,' and penal evil, which is 'death:' so the objection concerning the law 'that it is evil,' consists of two branches—the one, 'that the law is sin,' to which the apostle has just been replying, the other 'that the law is death,' which he forthwith proceeds to answer. When it is said 'that the law is death,' I understand the meaning to be—'that the law is the necessary cause of death,' as we have above shewn: for the objection regarding the law 'that it was sin,' amounted to this—'that the law was the necessary cause of sin;' the objection therefore conveyed in the words before us is—'that it follows, from the teaching of the apostle, that the law of God'—by which I understand 'the law renewed and ordained by Moses'—'is the necessary cause of death,' just as it was before objected—'that the law was the necessary cause of sin.' There is this difference however between the two objections, that the present is a conclusion, or is stated in the form of a conclusion. "Is then that which is good," that is—'the law,' "become death," that is 'the necessary cause of death' "unto me?" whereas the former was proposed in the manner of a question—"(shall we say) that the law is sin?" his opponents, thus becoming as it were more confident, are also rendered bolder from the circumstance of the apostle having a little before admitted that our death is effected 'by occasion of the law;' as if, forsooth, the manner of effecting were itself the efficient cause. "Far from it." The apostle replies by a contrast—'not the law, but sin is become death unto me.' Of this contrast the first and negative member is not a simple negation, but is amplified with rhetorical warmth, by an expression of abhorrence at such blasphemy: the force of which is:—'Far be it either that

the law should become death to man, or that the doctrine—that the law is the necessary cause of death, should be capable of being deduced from my teaching.' "Nay sin is become death unto me." This is the second member of the contrast; where by 'sin' I understand as before original and sinful sin, as the apostle himself explains it in this very verse, when he says—"that sin might become exceedingly sinful:" for this sinful and original sin produces every sort of lust, or is the fountain and necessary cause of subsequent sins; and these again, to use the language of James, "when consummated, bring forth death," and that as its necessary cause. The import therefore of the latter member of the contrast is—'that original sin, by producing subsequent sins, is the necessary cause of death to man:' and this, the apostle says, is the inference to be deduced from his teaching, and from what he has just said—'that sin taking occasion from the commandment deceived and slew him;' so that he has taught, not that the law, but that sin, by occasion of the law, is become death unto him. "That sin might be shewn working death unto me through that which is good." He next illustrates the second member of the contrast, and shews why he taught that sin was become death to him by occasion of the law, from its twofold end, the one of these ends following from the other. The first end is—'that it might be manifested and known that so great is the power of evil in sin that it wrought death, which is evil, to man, through the commandment which is good.'

"That sin, through the commandment, might become exceedingly sinful"—the second end, which is deduced from the former thus:—

'That which is manifested and known to produce evil out of good, is manifested to be exceedingly sinful, or exceedingly evil:

'But sin is manifested to produce evil out of good, or to work death to man through the commandment:

'Therefore, through the commandment, sin is manifested to be exceedingly sinful or evil.'

The apostle wishes therefore to say here—'that from his doctrine the malignity, not of the law, which is without any, but of sin,

which is excessive, is manifested; and that the extreme malignity of sin is manifested by his teaching in this way, because his teaching shews that sin produces evil out of good, that is, work for us both every sort of sin, and, in fine, death, by occasion of the law.

14. "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold so as to be made subject to sin." The apostle here proves the foregoing reply, and both members of the contrast; first—'that the law is not death or the necessary cause of death;' then—'that original sin is death or the cause of death.' The argument for the former is borrowed from the nature of the law. 'That which is spiritual is not death or the necessary cause of death.'

'But the law is spiritual:

'Therefore, the law is not death, or the necessary cause of death.

The argument for the latter is taken from our own nature, such as we are now since the fall.

'To those who are carnal, or sold under sin, that sin is death, or the necessary cause of death;

'But we, ever since the fall, are carnal, and sold,'—as the apostle explains it,—'so as to be made subject to sin:

'Therefore, sin is death to us.'

Or, if you prefer to unite the proofs of the two members of the contrast, the argument may be said to be drawn from a comparison of dissimilarity between ourselves and the law, in this way:—

'If the law be spiritual but we carnal, it is not the law, but the flesh within us which is become death, or the cause of death to us;

''But the former is true,'—for the apostle here proves it by an appeal to common experience,—'we know;' that is, 'we are taught by experience that the law is spiritual, but that we are carnal, expressing the latter by synecdoche, in his single person, to avoid the provoking of the flesh in others; whence he would conclude, 'that the law is not death to us, but the flesh which is in us, by occasion of the law,' as he has formerly said; or 'that the law is for death to us,' as he spoke in verse 10, 'only by accident, and

because of the inability * of the flesh,' as he afterwards speaks, chap. viii. 3. The expression, "the law is spiritual," signifies, 'that the law is the word and instrument of the Holy Spirit'—the same who is the "Spirit of life," or 'life-giving Spirit;' whence it follows, that the law is given for life to us, as was before said, or that it is the necessary cause of life—to wit, if any one be able to keep it, as we learn from Gal. iii. 12, and Lev. xviii. 5. Moreover, by our being "carnal," is meant, 'that we are subject to the flesh, and servants to sin and corruption;' for so the apostle himself explains it, when he defines the carnal man to be him who is "sold, so as to be made subject to sin."

15. "For what I practise I allow not; for I do not that which I would, but what I hate, that I do."

16. "But if I do that which I am unwilling to do, I consent to the law that it is good." The apostle now proceeds to establish each part of this experience, and of the foregoing assumption, separately, and two several times. He first establishes the former, viz., 'that we know that the law is spiritual,' in verses 15 and 16; next, the latter, viz., 'that we know that we are carnal, or sold under sin,' in the 17th, and following verses, as far as verse 22; when, having established both of these a second time, in verses 22, 23, the conclusion of the reply—'therefore sin is become death unto me'—is at length deduced in the 24th verse. The argument in proof of the first part, and which is contained in these two verses, is taken from the effect of the renewed and spiritual man, in so far as he is renewed and spiritual, of which the apostle here, as formerly, adduces himself as an example: 'I, being renewed, and in so far as I am renewed, consent to the law of God that it is good: 'Therefore, I know that the law is spiritual.'

He proves the antecedent from the adjunct of the contrariety between his own renewed will, and those things which he himself

* 'Ἀδυναμίαν.'

does contrary to the law: 'If that which I do, contrary to the law, I am unwilling to do, I consent to the law that it is good;

'But the former is true.'

The proposition is given in verse 16. The assumption is proved in verse 15, from its disparates:—'What I practise contrary to the law, I allow not; what I practise contrary to the law, I would not,' (the former being the approbation of the judgment; the latter of the will; and each being illustrated by a contrast,) 'but what I do contrary to the law, I hate:

'Therefore, that which I do contrary to the law, I am unwilling to do.'

17. "Now then it is no more I who practise it, but sin which dwelleth in me." He next proves the second part of the foregoing assumption and experience, viz., 'that we are carnal, and subject to sin,' from the case, illustrated by contrast, of the transgressions into which renewed men fall:—

'What I practise contrary to the law, not I, but sin which is in me practises:

'Therefore, I am carnal, and subject to sin;' or, which is the same thing, "I find (that I am under) this law, that when I would do good evil is present with me."

The antecedent is contained in the 17th verse; the consequent in verse 21.

18. "For I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth no good." This is a prolepsis by which, in passing, he anticipates the objection, 'Does sin then dwell in you, although renewed?' The apostle replies by a comparison of majority:—'Not only does sin dwell in me, but, what is more, there dwells no good in me.' At the same time, however, he inserts, within a parenthesis, this epanorthosis, 'When I say that sin dwells *in me*, I do not mean,' in me, so far as I am renewed, but so far as I am still flesh;' so that, "in me," is equivalent to, 'in my flesh.' He proves what he has said by his own experience—'I know this.' The apostle

therefore here teaches us, that the renewed man is a twofold man, viz., the *spirit*, by which he consents to the law, and the *flesh*, whereby he practises what is contrary to the law; and that both of these are perceptible to the Christian, and were known to himself by experience. "For to will is present with me, but I do not attain to the performance of that which is good." This is a second proof of indwelling sin, from the adjunct of the inability of the renewed man to do that which is good, which is illustrated by a contrast: 'Although I am willing to do what is good, yet what is good I am unable to perform:

'Therefore, in me (that is, in my flesh,) there dwelleth no good.'

19. "For I do not the good that I would; but the evil which I am unwilling to do, that do I."

20. "But if I do that which I am unwilling to do, it is no more I that do it, but sin which dwelleth in me."

21. "I find therefore (that I am under) this law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me." Having removed the objection, he returns to his main purpose, and proves the antecedent of v. 17—that not himself, but sin which was in him practised that which was contrary to the law. The argument is from disparates:—

'If I do that which I am unwilling to do, it is not I that do it, but sin which is in me;

'But the evil which I do I am unwilling to do:

'Therefore the evil which I do, it is not I that do, but sin which is in me.'

The conclusion has been already given in v. 17; the assumption is contained in v. 19, being illustrated by contrast—"I do not the good that I would, but the evil which I am unwilling to do, that do I;" the proposition follows in the 20th v. The antecedent having been thus proved, the consequent is deduced therefrom in the 21st v., as was before observed under v. 17.

22. "For I delight in the law of God, as to the inward man." The apostle now proves each part of the experience and assumption, brought before us in v. 14, a second time, as we formerly pointed out in our remarks on the 15th verse. The argument in proof of the first part of that experience, viz. 'that the law is spiritual' is taken from the adjunct of the delight of the spirit or inward man:—

'That in which the spirit or inward man delights is spiritual, that is, is given by the Spirit and given for life;

'But I delight in the law of God as to the spirit and inward man, that is in so far as I am spiritual and renewed:

'Therefore the law of God is spiritual.'

The assumption only of the syllogism is here given.

23. "But I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." This is the proof of the second part. The argument for it is taken from the efficient cause of our servitude under sin, which is—'the law of our members;' or 'the corruption of our nature:—

The law of my members, or the corruption of my nature, brings me into captivity to the law of sin;

'Therefore I am carnal, and sold so as to be made subject to sin.'

The antecedent is given in the text. Upon these words observe that by the "law of sin" is to be understood that dominion and power of sin whereby, as by a law, we are compelled to serve sin. Of this dominion and power the apostle has previously spoken in c. vi., v. 12 and 14; where although he denies that the renewed man, and he who is a child of grace is under that dominion, yet know that as there are the remains of sin within us, so the remains of that power—to which the apostle here complains that he was brought into captivity by the law of his members, that is, by the remaining strength of the corruption of his nature, as if by some law—survive in us so long as we continue in this world. Both this law, to which he

is brought into captivity, and the strength of sin by which he is made captive, the apostle explains by their subject; both are 'in our members;' and by their effect, which is, 'the struggle of the law of sin against the law of the mind.' By "the law of the mind" I understand the Spirit, or the power of the renovating Spirit in the new creature; for so the apostle himself explains it in Gal. v. 17, where 'the law of the members' is called "the flesh," and 'the law of the mind' styled "the Spirit;" and where, just as here, he teaches that these are contrary and repugnant the one to the other. By this the apostle would have us learn that as there are in the Christian, so long as he continues in this world, two men, as we have before observed on v. 15, viz.—"the flesh" and "the Spirit" or "mind," or—"the old man" and "the new man" "new creature" or inward man;" so between these two there is a perpetual struggle going on during the whole of our life below; for the law of the members carries on war against the law of the mind, as he here speaks, and "the flesh coveteth against the Spirit," as he says in the passage cited from Gal.; and so fierce is the struggle, that, as the apostle testifies of both sides—'we cannot do the good that we would, but the evil that we would not, that we do.'

21. "Oh wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Thus far the assumption and comparison of dissimilarity between ourselves and the law, given in verse 14, has been proved; whence the apostle here deduces the conclusion of the syllogism, which forms the reply to the objection of which we spoke in our remarks on the 13th verse—'therefore, sin is become death unto me,' or, which is the same thing—'my body is a body of sin, until I be delivered therefrom.' I take "body" here to be the opposite of "mind," and as "mind" is used for 'the inward man,' so I understand "body" as signifying 'the outward man,' in which the apostle has formerly declared that no good dwells. The apostle does not content himself with barely drawing this conclusion, but sets it off with a rhetorical exclamation and anacœnosis—"Oh wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from

this body of death?" as if he had said—'this body is a body of death, and death makes me wretched; who shall deliver me from it?'

25. "I give thanks to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." This is a hypophora, or the subjoined reply to the anacoenosis—'God has delivered me through Jesus Christ our Lord.' This deliverance through Christ he intimates by the result and effect of a consciousness of that deliverance being begun, which effect of our deliverance upon us is—'our giving thanks:' for he cannot but give thanks who is conscious that he has been delivered from sin through Christ apprehended by faith (as has been formerly shewn), and from death through the righteousness of Christ (which is immediately to be proved; this hypophora being an epitome and compendium of the constructive reasoning of both discussions.) "So then I myself with the mind indeed serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." This is the common conclusion of the destructive reasoning whereby the apostle has replied to the objections touching the law, from the 20th verse of chap. v., up to this place; and it relates to the commencement of obedience to the law in the renewed man. Of this obedience the apostle here proposes himself as an example: for when he here says—"I myself," this is not to be understood of him in particular, but the meaning is—'I, or any one who, like me, has been renewed by the Spirit of God.' The obedience of such an one he thus sets forth in his own example by a contrast—'I serve the law of God indeed, but I also serve the law of sin;' that is—'I so render obedience to the law, that I also transgress the law, during the whole of my life below: so that the obedience rendered to the law is only begun, and but partially begun; and that obedience to the law is partial both in me, and in all who, like me, are renewed. He illustrates each member of the contrast by its cause, obedience by "the mind," and transgression by "the flesh: for "the flesh," or, 'the remaining corruption of our nature, as the apostle has previously argued in chap. vii. 7. and following verses, is

the cause of every sort of lust and sin, that is, of transgression in the renewed man; whence it follows that "the mind" or 'spirit' and 'new creature' is in like manner the cause of begun obedience:—'I, being renewed, serve the law of God, so far as my mind is concerned, or in so far as I am renewed; and the mind, or new creature, which is the spirit as opposed to the flesh, and the effect of the spirit of regeneration, is the cause of that obedience of mine: this obedience however is imperfect, for I, the same man renewed, also transgress [the law of God], and serve the law of sin; and the cause of this transgression is the flesh or the still remaining corruption of my nature.' This epitome, as it were, of the whole discussion regarding the law, the apostle deduces as a corollary from the foregoing conclusion which was given in verse 24: 'My body, although I am renewed, is, because of the law of my members, a body of death:

'Therefore, although with my mind I serve the law of God, yet with my still remaining flesh I serve the law of sin, that is sinful sin, which is contrary to the law of God.'

This one conclusion and corollary of the apostle meets, by inference at least, all the preceding objections touching the law; for, in the first place, it is manifest, from this conclusion, that we ought to serve the law ordained by God, and that all we who are renewed and become new creatures, do serve it with the mind; whence the reply to the first objection is at hand—'that the law is not useless, nor given by God to no purpose, as was first objected, but that it serves a twofold purpose; first, on account of him who is not renewed, to whom it displays sin, and, by displaying, increases it, as was formerly said, chap. v., 20; for he should serve the law, which he does not serve, but, on the contrary, the more he knows of it, the more he sins and struggles against it known; secondly, to the renewed man, to whom, serving the law, it affords light for all manner of obedience into holiness.' In the next place, it is manifest, from this conclusion, that the law of God and the law of sin are contraries; for "with the mind," says the apostle, "I serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin;" whence there fol-

lows a reply to the two remaining objections touching the law:—1st, 'That the law of God is not the law of sin, or sinful sin,' as was objected, chap. vii. 7; 2d, 'That the law of God is not death,' which was the objection brought forward in chap. vii., 13, for death is the consequence of sin, but that sinful sin, or inherent corruption, which is contrary to the law of God, is the cause of every sin, and of death from sin as has been before replied.

CHAPTER VIII.

1. "There is therefore now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus." From the 18th verse of chapter 1 up to this place the subject of righteousness has been discussed. Next comes the discussion concerning life and salvation, as we stated in our remarks on the same 18th verse of the first chapter. This discussion, like the former, consists of two parts: the constructive reasoning, which is contained in the chapter before us; and the destructive, which is given in the following chapters, as far as chapter xii.

In the constructive reasoning or affirmative part of the discussion, the leading conclusion is—'that there is eternal life and certain salvation to all those, and those only who are righteous through the faith of Jesus Christ according to the gospel,' or which is the same thing, and equivalent thereto—that "there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus;" for life or salvation and condemnation are so directly opposed to each other, that either of them being affirmed, the other is denied, and the contrary. Therefore, although the apostle here reasons affirmatively concerning life and salvation, yet he states his conclusion in the form of a negation of the contrary:—'Therefore there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus.' By "condemnation" I understand here—'the sentence of God, as Judge, against man concerning sin and death:' whether that sentence

be pronounced by man's own conscience during this life, or by Christ the Lord at his coming: for the apostle, John, makes mention of both when he says, 1 Ep. iii. 20—"If our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart;" intimating that there is against the sinner a two-fold condemnation,—one of his own heart or conscience, and another of God who is greater; and that the latter is more to be dreaded than the former. Against each of these, both the stings of conscience in this life, and the fear of being rejected by the Lord at his coming, the apostle comforts believers by the conclusion before us—that there is no condemnation, either of conscience in the present life, or by the Lord at his coming, against those who are in Christ Jesus.—"Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." This is an epanorthosis of the foregoing conclusion, and a description of those who are in Jesus Christ from their acting, amplified by a contrast of causes; their acting is,—'that they walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.' This description and epanorthosis of his assertion the apostle subjoins on account of hypocrites, and those who have a "dead faith," as the apostle James speaks, chap. ii. 17; that is—'who boast that they are Christ's, and partakers of the redemption that is in him, whilst they are still in sin, and consequently not in Jesus Christ:' to prevent such from deceiving themselves and others, the apostle here says—'that those are not in Christ who do not walk in the Spirit, and that those only are believers, who, by walking after the Spirit, shew that they are really *ingrafted in Christ*;' as the Syriac Paraphrast appears to have understood this passage (See his version).* The apostle deduces his present conclusion, from the constructive reasoning of the preceding discussion concerning the righteousness of faith in this way:—'To those who are in Christ Jesus, and who give evidence that they are really in him by walking after the Spirit, there is no condemnation.' The proposition which the apostle omits, and which is—'to those who are righteous there is no condemnation,' is an undoubted axiom,

* [ ] qui non ambulant secundum carnem in Christo Jesu.—*Ed.*]

and beyond controversy on the part either of Jews or Gentiles; this, if you think proper, being supplied, the entire syllogism will be as follows:—

'To those who are righteous there is no condemnation'—which will be disputed by none;

'But those who are in Christ apprehended by faith are righteous,' as was formerly proved:

'Therefore to those who are in Christ, and who give evidence of this by walking after the Spirit, there is no condemnation'—as he here concludes. This is the syllogism of the gospel, and stands opposed to that of the law which is the following:—

'The condemnation of those who are unrighteous is just;

'But those who transgress the law are sinners and unrighteous:

'Therefore the condemnation of those who transgress the law is just.'

These syllogisms present the theory and general doctrine both of the law and of the gospel; but because it is a particular explanation, and not a general theory which is effectual either for direction by the law, or for consolation and salvation by the gospel, the apostle, in this discussion concerning life and salvation, descends from the common theory to a particular application. Of this application there are two syllogisms relating to the law, and two to the gospel: the first relating to the law applies sin, the second, death; the first relating to the gospel, righteousness, and the second, life.

The first legal syllogism runs thus:—

'Whoever transgresseth the law is a sinner and unrighteous'—which is the assumption of the general syllogism;

'But I have transgressed the law'—conscience puts in this assumption:

'Therefore I am a sinner and unrighteous.'

The second legal syllogism is the following:—

'Whosoever is a sinner and unrighteous, his condemnation is just, for death is the wages of sin'—this was the proposition of the general syllogism;

'But I am a sinner and unrighteous'—here conscience again supplies the assumption;

'Therefore my condemnation is just.'

To these stand opposed two evangelical syllogisms; the first of which is:—

'Those who are in Christ, apprehended through the faith of the gospel, are righteous'—this the assumption of the general syllogism and antecedent of the foregoing enthymeme, has been demonstrated by the apostle, from chap. i. 18, to chap. v. 20;

'But I am in Jesus Christ'—the testimony of the indwelling Spirit and the work of regeneration, in him who is conscious of it, adding this assumption:

'Therefore I am righteous, and set free from sin.

The second evangelical syllogism runs thus:—

'To those who are in Christ, apprehended through the faith of the gospel, there is no condemnation'—this was the conclusion of the general syllogism and consequent of the foregoing enthymeme;

'But I am in Christ Jesus'—which is to be tried by the testimony and work of the indwelling Spirit, as has just been said:

'Therefore to me there is no condemnation.'

All and each of the parts of this last syllogism are discussed by the apostle in his constructive reasoning concerning life and salvation in the chapter before us.

First of all, we have the proposition, which is the above conclusion of the apostle—"There is no condemnation to those who are in Jesus Christ, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" this conclusion, having been stated in the first verse, is established in the verses that follow, as far as verse 9; whence to verse 31, the assumption is discussed; and the conclusion from that verse to the end of the chapter.

2. "For the law of the Spirit of life (who is) in Jesus Christ hath delivered me from the law of sin and of death." As the proposition itself was twofold, so the proof of it is likewise divided into two branches; for the apostle first proves, in verses 2, 3,

and the beginning of verse 4, 'that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus;' and then, in the end of verse 4, and the following verses, as far as verse 9, 'that that freedom from condemnation belongs to those who are not hypocritically, but really in Christ;' that is, "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." The argument for the first branch, or that whereby is proved the certainty of the salvation of those who are really in Christ Jesus, is drawn from the effect of the gospel, and of its spiritual ministration, that is, of the gospel rendered effectual through the internal operation of the Holy Spirit; for so I understand the expression, "the law of the Spirit of life," here, as opposed to "the letter" of "death," or "the ministration of condemnation," 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7. For as condemnation, or death, which is the effect of the letter which "killeth," and deliverance, or the certainty of salvation,—which is the effect of the law of the Spirit, or of the gospel,—are contrary to each other, so, the argument being from opposites, the syllogism runs thus:—

'There is no condemnation to those who have been delivered by the law of the Spirit of life from the law of sin and of death.

'But the law of the Spirit of life has delivered me, says the apostle,' and all who with me are in Jesus Christ, from the law of sin and of death:

'Therefore there is no condemnation, either to me, or to any who are in Jesus Christ.'

The assumption is given in the text; for the understanding of which, besides what we have just said concerning the law of the Spirit, three things are necessary to be known. First, then, you must know that by the Spirit here is meant the Holy Spirit, whom the apostle describes in these words by his effect, and subject. He is denominated the Spirit of life, because he not only is life, but works life in us, especially the life of God and spiritual or inward life; therefore he is denominated "the Spirit of life" from his effect. Then it is added "in Christ Jesus;" both because he is "the Spirit of the Son," and because he is given to us in Christ the Son of God, (Gal. iv. 6.) These words are added,

in fine, because this effect of deliverance is *in* Christ, and not out of Christ; for the other gifts of the Spirit of God are perceived both in the world and out of Christ; but this gift of deliverance, and by which one is certain of his own salvation, belongs to the elect alone, nor is any where perceived, except in the mystical Christ and the members of his body; this is the second part of the description of the Spirit from his subject. Secondly, you must know that when it is said—"the law of the Spirit hath delivered me," this is not to be understood, of the *effecting* of that deliverance, for Christ has effected our deliverance by his death; but the law of the Spirit, or the spiritual ministration of the gospel, is said to deliver us in two ways: 1st, Because it announces the deliverance which Christ has wrought by external preaching; 2d, Because it seals the same within us by internal operation: so that "to deliver" is here—'to certify me of my deliverance by the preaching of the external ministry, and by the inward operation of the Spirit,' which is called 'deliverance' by a metonymy of the subject for the adjunct. The third and last thing which it is necessary to know here is, what is meant by "the law of sin and of death;" under which expression I conceive are included both 'the law of the members,' which "brings me into captivity to the law of sin" (see above, chap. vii. 23.) and 'the law ordained by Moses,' which itself also, accidentally, and through the inability of the flesh, as we are immediately told, is 'the letter that killeth' and "the ministration of death, (see 2 Cor. iii. 6, 7; and above, chap. vii. 10.)

3. "For what the law was unable to do, being weak through the flesh, God, sending his own son in a form like to that of flesh subject to sin, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.

"That the rights of the law may be fulfilled in us." This is the proof of the foregoing assumption, from the subject and end of the gospel; the subject being set forth in two parts. The first part of the subject is—'the mission of the Son in the flesh,' or 'the incarnation of Christ.' This is explained by a similitude; for the flesh and humanity of Christ, although not subject to sin, yet 'in

form was like to flesh subject to sin;' so that Christ-man, that is, Christ in his flesh, was a man in all respects like to ourselves, sin excepted. The apostle does not deny that it was real flesh in which the Son of God was sent, but says that it was like to *sinful* flesh; the flesh of Christ, therefore, was real flesh, but in that flesh there was no sin. The second part of the subject of the gospel is,—'the condemnation of sin in the flesh.' By "the flesh" here I understand—'the flesh of Christ,' which, although it was not subject to sin, yet became subject to condemnation on account of sin, and in the room of sinful flesh: for as it was the violation of the law in the flesh by which God was offended; so it behoved satisfaction to be made in the flesh. Sinful flesh being unable to render this satisfaction, 'God,' says the apostle, 'sent his Son in real flesh, like to that which was sinful, that sin might be condemned in that which was not sinful, and satisfaction made for the sin of sinful flesh;' where, by 'condemnation,' I understand —'the punishment for sin which Christ underwent, and the abolishing of sin by himself.' This condemnation of sin, or the punishment by which it is abolished, is explained by its final cause:* —'sin was condemned,' that is, 'punishment was inflicted in the flesh of Christ, and that because we had sinned against God;' so that the final cause * of the condemnation of sin in the flesh of the Son of God was our sin. Both this condemnation and the incarnation of the Son of God are explained by their common efficient cause:—'for God,' says the apostle, 'both sent his son in the flesh, and condemned sin in the flesh of his Son.' Thus far the subject of the gospel: its end is set forth in these words at the commencement of verse 4,—"that the rights of the law may be fulfilled in us (by the condemnation of sin in the flesh of the Son of God.)" By "the rights of the law" I understand here—'that righteousness which the law requires;' which being rendered, its rights are rendered to the law, and from which he who shall err even in the least degree violates the law, and detracts from its rights. Moreover these rights of the law "are fulfilled in us" by

* Or 'cause why.'

the condemnation of sin in the flesh of Christ, because that condemnation is imputed to us, as though sin had been condemned in our own flesh; so that whatever has been detracted from the rights of the law, by our sin and transgression, is again restored to the law. By the 'condemnation of sin in Christ,' then, 'and that on our account,' I understand—'the abolishing of sin,'—which the apostle John, 1 Eph. iii. 8, calls 'the destruction of the works of the devil,'—'and that by the satisfaction of Jesus Christ; so that our sin being now abolished, the law has nothing to complain of as regards us who are found in Christ Jesus.' The import of the words therefore is:—'The law of the Spirit, or the spiritual ministration of the gospel proclaims and seals that God, by sending his own Son in the flesh, has fully punished, and by punishing has so abolished all the sins of us who believe, that the rights of the law are fulfilled in us;' or 'so that the law having been kept by him, and on our account, we are justified with the approbation of the law,' as was before said, c. iii. 31. The proof of the assumption therefore runs thus:—'That—by which it is proclaimed that the Son, having been sent in the flesh by the Father, has condemned sin in the flesh,' that is, 'has abolished sin by paying its price with his death, that the rights of the law may be fulfilled in us for whom he died—delivers me, and all who with me are in Christ, from the law of sin and of death;

"But Christ incarnate and dying in the flesh for the condemnation of sin, and that the rights of the law might be fulfilled in us—is proclaimed by the gospel, or law of the Spirit:

'Therefore the gospel or law of the Spirit who is in Christ Jesus, delivers me from the law of sin and of death.'

The assumption only is given in the text, viz., in ver. 3, and the beginning of ver. 4, illustrated in ver. 3 by opposing to it its privative opposite, or 'the inability* of the law;' this inability or impotence of the law again, in order that it may appear to belong to the law by accident, is explained by its necessary cause, which is 'our flesh,' or 'the corruption of

* Ἀδυναμία.

our nature,' on account of which we are unable to keep the law. "Who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." The apostle makes a transition to the second branch of the proof, by repeating his description of those who are in Christ, which is at the same time a description of those in whom the rights of the law are fulfilled: he accordingly proves in the following verses, as far as ver. 9, that this pardon from condemnation of which he is speaking, belongs to those who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. The argument by which this is established is taken from privative opposites:—

'Death is theirs who walk after the flesh, but life and peace are theirs who walk after the Spirit.

'Therefore there is no condemnation, or there is freedom from condemnation to us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.'

The consequent of this enthymeme is contained in the words quoted from the end of ver. 4; the antecedent he immediately proceeds to prove.

5. "For they that are after the flesh are wise as to the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit as to the things of the Spirit.

6. "For the wisdom of the flesh is death; but the wisdom of the Spirit is life and peace.'

His argument is taken from the appropriate effects of the flesh and Spirit, which are—'the wisdom of the flesh and the wisdom of the Spirit:'—

'The wisdom of the flesh is death, but the wisdom of the Spirit life and peace;

'But those who are after the flesh are wise as to the things of the flesh, and those who are after the Spirit as to the things of the Spirit:

'Therefore death is theirs who are after the flesh, but peace and life and no condemnation are theirs who are after the Spirit.'

The conclusion, which is at the same time the antecedent of the

foregoing enthymeme, is postponed to ver. 8. The other parts of the syllogism are given in the text: but, by hysterosis, the assumption takes precedence of the proposition, the former being contained in the fifth and the latter in the sixth verse. I regard the proposition as tropical and expressed by a metonymy, partly of the effect for the efficient cause, and partly of the adjunct for the subject: "the wisdom of the flesh is death," *i. e.*—'the efficient cause of death;' "the wisdom of the Spirit is life and peace," *i. e.*—'produces the certainty of life and peace;' for the wisdom of the Spirit is the proof and sign which seals the life and peace which are through Christ, and is therefore a part of that life, and the beginning of it. It should be observed that in both the proposition and assumption, 'to be after the flesh,' or 'in the flesh,' is the cause of 'walking after the flesh;' and to be after the Spirit, or 'in the Spirit,' the cause of walking after the Spirit: but inasmuch as these causes and their effects are reciprocal, the apostle here uses both forms of expression—viz. 'to walk after the flesh,' and 'to be after the flesh;' and again 'to walk after the Spirit,' and 'to be after the Spirit,'—for the same thing.

7. "Because the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God." He here proves the first part of the proposition, viz.—'that the wisdom of the flesh is death.' The argument by which he proves it is taken from the effect of fleshly wisdom, viz., 'enmity against God,' which again is the cause of death:—

'Enmity against God is death, or the cause of death;

'But the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God, that is the cause and source of that enmity:

'Therefore the wisdom of the flesh is death.'

"For it is not subject to the law of God, for indeed it cannot be." In these words he proves the foregoing assumption, viz., 'that the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God,' from the disparate of fleshly wisdom which is—'to be subject to the law of God:'—

'That which is not subject to the law of God is enmity against God;

But the wisdom of the flesh, or the wisdom of man in the flesh

and corrupt as he now is, is not subject to the law of God'—this assumption being amplified by a comparison of minority—'not only is the wisdom of man not subject, but it cannot indeed be subject to the divine law;' whence the foregoing assumption follows concluded—

'Therefore the wisdom of the flesh is enmity against God.

8. "Therefore they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Last of all comes the conclusion of the second branch of the proof, viz.—'that freedom from condemnation belongs not to those who walk after the flesh.' The terms of the conclusion are however changed; for 'to be in the flesh' is put instead of 'to walk after the flesh,' the cause, namely, for the effect, as we have before pointed out; and likewise 'the displeasure of God' instead of 'the condemnation of carnal man,' which is also a metonymy of the cause for the effect; for in the anger and displeasure of God, the condemnation of those who do not please God is certain. This is the way in which I explain the passage. But it may also be said that there is in these words a second argument for this second branch of the proof, (viz.—'that freedom from condemnation belongs not to those who walk after the flesh,') the argument being taken from the disparate of that freedom, thus:—

Freedom from condemnation belongs not to those, who do not please God, or who are under the wrath of God, and are, as the apostle calls them, "children of wrath;"

'But those who are in the flesh not only do not please God, but are not even able to please him'—so this assumption is stated in the verse before us, amplified by a comparison of minority: whence follows the conclusion—

'Therefore those who are in the flesh, or walk after the flesh, are to be condemned, nor does the freedom which is here announced belong to them.'

9. "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit." Thus far the proof of the proposition, and the first section of the chapter. Next

comes the second section, and the assumption of the first and leading syllogism, of which, as of the proposition, there are two parts, the one being—'but ye are in Christ Jesus;' the other—"but ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit," or "walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Both of these parts are handled in this second section of the chapter; but, by hysterosis, the latter occupies the first place from ver. 9 to ver. 14, and the former the second place from ver. 14 to ver. 31. The latter part of the assumption, therefore, is contained in this 9th verse, viz.—'you "who are at Rome, saints, called," whether from among the Jews or from among the Gentiles, you, I say, are not in the flesh;' that is, 'whosoever of you has "the anointing," as John speaks, and knows concerning himself that he is not in the flesh but in the Spirit.' "Since the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." He proceeds to prove the foregoing assumption, viz.—'that they are not in the flesh;' and the arguments by which he establishes it are two. The first is taken from the efficient cause of their certainty that they have been translated out of the flesh into the Spirit, which is—'the indwelling of the Spirit,' known to themselves and apprehended by the spiritual sense; and the syllogism of the argument runs thus:—

'Those in whom the Spirit of God dwells are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit;

'But the Spirit of God dwells in you:

'Therefore you are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit.

"But if any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not his." He proves the assumption which alone is given in the text, indirectly, by what equally follows in the case of contradictories, thus:—

'If any one have not the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him, he is not Christ's:

'Therefore, you who are Christ's, have the Spirit of Christ dwelling in you.'

10. "Moreover, if Christ be in you, the body indeed is dead because of sin, but the Spirit is life because of righteousness"—the second argument for the assumption from the effect of the in-

dwelling Spirit which is 'our renewal.' Of this there are two parts here set forth by the apostle: the first is—'the mortification of the body or old man;' the second—'the quickening of the Spirit or new creature.' "The body" or 'old man' is said "to be mortified," when we die to the body, the old man, or the flesh; as on the other hand, "the Spirit" or 'new creature' is said to be quickened, when we live to the Spirit more and more every day: So that what is here said—that "the body is dead," is nothing else, than what the apostle formerly said in chap. vi. 2—that "we are dead unto sin;" and to say—that "the Spirit is life," is the same thing as to say—that 'we live by the Spirit,' or 'live the life of God.' Each of these parts, viz.—'the mortification of the body,' and 'the life of the Spirit,' is explained by its final cause;* for the Holy Spirit is the efficient cause of both. But if you ask *why* the body is mortified or becomes dead, the apostle replies—"because of sin;" that is—'in order that we may cease to sin,' which cannot take place so long as the body is alive, or while the corrupt nature prevails within us: or if you prefer it, when the apostle here says—"because of sin," he may be understood to mean—'that we die to the body because of sin; that is—because of a consciousness or sense of sin, and a dread of judgment in consequence of sin; neither of which we can escape, unless we die to the body and our corrupt nature. In like manner if you ask *why* and for what cause the Holy Spirit makes us to live by the Spirit, the apostle replies—"because of righteousness;" that is—'inasmuch as we have been reconciled to God by the righteousness and full satisfaction of Christ the Holy Spirit sanctifies us, or makes us to live by the Spirit, for this purpose, that abstaining from sin we may live unto God, to whom we have been reconciled.' The argument in proof of the assumption therefore runs thus:—

'Those are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, to whom the body is dead that they may serve the flesh no longer in the lusts thereof, and to whom the Spirit is life that they may serve God, having been reconciled through the righteousness of Christ;

* Or 'cause why.'

'But your body is dead because of sin, and your life is spiritual because of righteousness:

'Therefore you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit.'

11. "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwelleth in you." This is an epanorthosis, whereby, to prevent the saints from referring what he has said concerning the death of the body, to the destruction of the body itself and "this earthly tabernacle," as he denominates it, 2 Cor. v. 1, especially as it is mortal and perishable through the corruption of our nature, the apostle in these words consoles them with the announcement of the resurrection of that same body, which, through sin, is mortal and perishable. This resurrection of the body he amplifies by its subject and efficient cause. The subject is—'those in whom dwells the Spirit of him who raised up Jesus from the dead,' that is, those to whom belongs that certainty of salvation and freedom from condemnation, which the apostle is discussing in this chapter; for although the resurrection of the body is common to all, yet those only in whom the Spirit of life dwells will rise again to life and glory: the apostle, therefore, consoles with the announcement of a future resurrection those only to whom it will be a benefit; not to mention that the first resurrection, and its increase day by day, is the peculiar privilege of those in whom this spirit of life dwells. Thus far of the subject. A twofold efficient cause is pointed out; first in order is—'God the Father;' third in order is—'the Holy Spirit.' Each of these is defined by his effect—God the Father raised up Christ the son from the dead; and the dead in Christ are raised up with Christ though the Holy Spirit, both in this world, more and more every day, to a new life, and, at the coming of the Lord, to eternal life, to each of which resurrections, through the Holy Spirit, the apostle here alludes. Of both these resurrections also, God the Father is the author first in order, the Son, the cause second in order, and, third in order, the Holy Spirit;

for as the Father is the first person in the Trinity, the Son the second, and the Holy Spirit the third; so the works common to the three persons, which relate to external objects, and have respect to creatures, are performed *by* the Father, *in* the Son, *through* the Holy Spirit: 'the Father,' says the apostle here, 'raises up the dead in the Son, through the Holy Spirit;' and the same thing may be said of all similar actions of the Deity,—God the Father, as the first person, is the efficient cause first in order, and all things are performed by him; the Son of God, as the second person, is the second efficient cause, and all things are performed in him; lastly, as the Holy Spirit is the third person in the Trinity, so he is the efficient cause third in order, and all things are performed through him. The Holy Spirit is also here described by his indwelling in the saints.

12. "So then, brethren, we are not debtors to the flesh, that we should live after the flesh." This is an inference, wherein he exhorts to a new life, or rather dissuades from walking after the flesh; to enforce which two arguments are here adduced. Of these the first is taken from the adjunct of those who live after the flesh, which is the disparate to that of all who have been renewed through the indwelling Spirit; this adjunct being the debt or obligation, whereby those who are after the flesh, are under obligation to the flesh as ruling over them, to live after the flesh. The syllogism of the proof runs thus:—

'All who live after the flesh are debtors to the flesh, that they should live after the flesh;

'But we, brethren, are not debtors to the flesh, that we should live after the flesh;

'Therefore let us not live after the flesh.'

Only the assumption is given in the text, being inferred from the foregoing second proof of the assumption [of the leading syllogism] thus:—

'The body indeed,' that is—'the flesh, or our corrupt nature,' 'is dead; therefore we are not debtors to the flesh, that we should

live after the flesh, for death dissolves the obligation;' just as he formerly reasoned concerning the law at the first v. of chap. vii.

13. "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." This is the second argument of dissuasion, taken from the wages of sin, or the effect of living after the flesh, which effect is the death of those who live after the flesh. The argument runs thus:—

'If you live after the flesh, you shall die:

'Therefore live not after the flesh.'

The antecedent is given in the commencement of this 13th v. "But if ye by the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.' In these words the antecedent is proved by what equally follows on the contrary supposition, which is put in contrast with it:

'If, by the Spirit, you mortify the deeds of the body you shall live:

'Therefore, if you live after the flesh you shall die.'

14. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the ons of God." Thus far one part of the leading assumption has een discussed; next, by hysterosis, comes the first part, viz., but ye are in Jesus Christ,' or, 'every one of you is certain that e is in Christ.' This part is not, indeed, itself expressed here, ut is proved in two distinct members; for it is first argued, 'that hey are the sons of God;' then, 'that they are heirs of God, and oint-heirs with Christ;' and from these two follows the third, vhich is here omitted, viz., 'that they are in Christ;' since no man an be a son or heir of God, without being in Christ. He therefore proves the first of these two members from the inseparable adjunct of the sons of God, which is, 'to be led or guided by the Spirit of God;' and the syllogism by which it is proved runs thus:—

'As many as are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God, and consequently are in Jesus Christ;

'But you are led by the Spirit of God:

'Therefore, you are the sons of God, and consequently in Jesus Christ.'

The proposition alone is expressed in this verse; the proof of

which proposition, along with that of the omitted assumption, are given in the two following verses, 15 and 16, where each is established by two arguments.

15. "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, (*i. e.*) Father." The first argument is taken from the nature of the spirit by which we are led: it is 'the spirit of adoption.' "Adoption," moreover, is 'the affiliation or reception into the dignity of sons of those who formerly were not sons:' "the spirit of adoption," therefore, is that spirit which seals adoption, or the dignity of sons of God bestowed in Christ, God's only Son, on those who were by nature "the children of wrath." This argument is to be adapted to the proof of the proposition in this way:—

'As many as are led by the spirit of adoption are the sons of God,' as is obvious from what we have just said concerning adoption;

'But the Spirit of God is the spirit of adoption:

'Therefore, as many as are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God.'

The assumption is given in this 15th verse, illustrated by a contrast: 'The Spirit of God given to the elect, through the gospel, is not the spirit of bondage, but the spirit of adoption.' Each member of this contrast is explained by its effect: bondage, indeed, by 'fear,' but adoption by 'an inward cry in the hearts of believers, whereby' he shows that 'they call upon God as their Abba, or Father:' the proposition is thus proved by these words. The proof of the supposed assumption is tacitly implied in the words, "ye have received," in this way:—

'All those who have received the Spirit of God, or of adoption, are led by the Spirit of God or of adoption;

'But you,' says the apostle to the believing Romans, 'have received the Spirit of adoption and of God:

'Therefore, you are led by the Spirit of God,' which was the assumption of the foregoing syllogism.

16. "Which same Spirit beareth witness, along with our spirit, that we are the sons of God." This is the second argument, whereby, both the proposition, which is expressed in verse 14, and the assumption, which, as we have remarked on that verse, is understood, are established. This argument is taken from a twofold testimony: the one divine, being that of the indwelling Holy Spirit, "which Spirit,"—viz., 'the Holy Spirit and Spirit of adoption,' —"beareth witness," says the apostle: the other human,—being that of our own spirit, now renewed by the Holy Spirit,—"beareth witness," says he, "along with our spirit." These Spirits, therefore,—both the Holy Spirit and our spirit,—renewed by him, as two witnesses, cry within us, and unitedly testify that God is our Abba, Father, and that we are the sons of God in Christ, the only begotten Son. Both of these cries or testimonies, as well that of the Holy Spirit, as that of our own spirit, renewed by him, I conceive to be included in faith; for the Holy Spirit cries and bears witness to us that we are the sons of God, by working faith in us, and sealing us in Jesus Christ; and our own spirit, renewed by him, in like manner cries and bears witness to us that we are the sons of God, by apprehending, by faith, Jesus Christ, and the grace which, through the Holy Spirit, is revealed in him. From this twofold inward testimony of the Spirit arises the outward cry and sacred invoking, whereby the elect call upon God, as their Father unto righteousness and salvation; for so the apostle himself seems to explain his meaning, farther on, when he says, (chap. x. verses 13, 14,) "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," and, immediately after, "How shall they call upon him on whom they have not believed?" We see, therefore, that the invoking or outward cry arises from the inward cry or faith, and that both are unto salvation.

17. "But if sons, also heirs; heirs indeed of God, and joint heirs with Christ." Thus far the proof of our being sons. He now proceeds to establish the second member, viz.—'that we are heirs of God with Christ,' the argument for which is taken from

its cause, namely, 'our adoption,' which has been already proved:

'All who are the sons of God are also heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ;

'But you are the sons of God'—as has been already proved:

'Therefore you are also heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ.'

From this, as we formerly said, the apostle infers—'that we are in Christ Jesus,' which is the first part of the assumption, as was remarked on verse 14. "If so be that we suffer with him." This is an epanorthosis, and the annexed condition of obtaining the inheritance with Christ, namely—'our participation with Christ in his cross, and our holy confirmation with him under the cross: "That we may be also glorified along with him"—an illustration of the annexed condition from its end.

18. "For I hold that the afflictions of this present time are by no means equal to the glory which is about to be revealed in us." The mention of the above condition leads the apostle into a digression, in which he encourages those who are in Christ, or who are joint heirs with him, to suffer with Christ. The arguments which he employs for this purpose are two: the one taken from a comparison of inequality between our sufferings and the glory by which they are followed; the other from the issue or end of these sufferings, viz. that they work for our good: upon the first of which arguments the apostle dwells from this 18th verse to verse 28; upon the second from verse 28, to verse 31. The first argument is proleptical; there is therefore, in these words, a prolepsis whereby he anticipates an objection suggested by the condition of the inheritance spoken of in the verse immediately preceding;—'Are we then,' an objector might ask, 'to procure that inheritance by our own sufferings, when throughout the whole of the constructive reasoning of your first discussion, you have established the contrary, viz.—that the inheritance is from faith through grace (c. iv. 16), and neither from our own works nor sufferings, otherwise grace would be no longer grace, (c. xi. 6)?' To this objection the apostle, in these words, thus forcibly replies, in order

that he may briefly shew—both that the inheritance is not to be procured by our own sufferings, and yet that for the sake of it we ought most gladly to suffer anything: so that, in the same breath, he both overthrows the merit of our sufferings, and encourages us to suffer. In these words, therefore, he first of all refutes the idea of our sufferings being meritorious, by contradicting the objection—'I hold that the inheritance is not to be procured by our own sufferings;' the argument for which, taken, as has been already said, from a comparison of inequality between our sufferings and the inheritance or grace to be revealed, runs thus:—

'All the sufferings of this life are not equal to that inheritance nor worthy of it:

'Therefore the inheritance is not procured by sufferings.'

The force of the consequence depends upon the self-evident and obvious axiom—'that wages cannot be merited unless the work or suffering shall have been equal to and worthy of the wages.' This is implied in the words of the apostle above, at chap. iv. 4,—"to him that worketh the reward is imputed from debt," as much as to say—'unless the wages be due, and the work equal to and worthy of the reward, the reward is not given for the work;' and the same thing may be said of sufferings: our sufferings and works therefore, merit nothing, nothing is procured by them, unless they be worthy (ἀξια, as the apostle here speaks) of the reward. To this, which is the general proposition, and sufficiently obvious, according to the apostle, he here subjoins the assumption—'that the sufferings of this life are not equal to the inheritance or glory to be revealed:' whence he teaches us to conclude, as he himself has done before—'that the inheritance is from grace, and not from debt nor procured by our own sufferings.' The idea of our sufferings being meritorious having been thus overthrown, the apostle, nevertheless, encourages us to suffer for the inheritance, and he does so by the same argument in this way:—

'I hold,' that is, 'every thing having been duly considered, I conclude, that all our sufferings in the present life are unequal to, less than, and unworthy of the glory to be revealed in us, or that

glorious inheritance, our right to which has been established in Christ Jesus:

'Therefore as "Jesus Christ, the author and finisher of (our) faith, for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame," (Heb. xii. 2,) so should we most gladly suffer anything with him, that we may be also glorified along with him, and in him become heirs of God.

19. "For the creation watching as it were with thrust-out head waiteth for the revelation of the sons of God." He proceeds to prove the antecedent of each of the foregoing enthymemes, and to shew that the excellence of the glory to be revealed is greater beyond all comparison than our sufferings. This he does by three arguments, or by a threefold testimony: the first is the common testimony of created things, or of creation, contained in this and the following verses, as far as verse 23; the second is that of men having the first-fruits of the Spirit, in the 23d and subsequent verses, as far as verse 26; the third is that of the Holy Spirit in verses 26, 27: so that all these three—creation (ἡ κτίσις), the renewed man, and the Holy Spirit through whom he is renewed—are adduced as witnesses to the excellence of the glory of the sons of God, and that it exceeds, beyond all comparison, all our sufferings with Christ here, in hope of hereafter enjoying it in the life of bliss. The testimonies of each of these witnesses are shewn, one by one, from the effects of the witnesses themselves. And, first, the common testimony of creation or created things is shewn from their effect, which is illustrated by the adjunct of the mode of effecting: 'creation waits for the glory to be revealed'—this is the effect; and it waits for it 'with thrust-out head,' or 'with intense longing'—this is the mode of effecting. The apostle therefore reasons thus:—

'Creation waits with intense longing for the revelation of the glory of the sons of God:

'Therefore, according to the testimony of creation, the glory—to be revealed—of the sons of God is beyond measure excellent.'

20. "For creation has been made subject to vanity." He here proves the antecedent, viz.—'that created things wait with thrust-out head, or with intense longing, for the glory—to be revealed—of the sons of God.' The arguments by which he proves it are two: the first is taken from the adjunct of the present condition of created things; the second from the adjunct of the pain and sorrow or sighs of created things, under their present condition. As regards the former, namely, the adjunct of the present condition of created things, the apostle shews the truth of the antecedent from it in this way:—

'Creation, or created things have been made subject to vanity, in hope of deliverance into the glory of the sons of God:

'Therefore, creation waits with intense longing for the revelation of that glory.'

The antecedent is given in verses 20, 21, where the present condition of created things is shewn, being represented as consisting in two things: first, 'that created things have been made subject to vanity;' and, secondly, that they have been made subject in the hope of deliverance.' As regards the first, under the name of vanity, I understand here two things: 1st, 'man himself,' to whom created things have been made subject, and whom they serve, who, in Ps. lxii. 10, is called "vanity," and "vainer than vanity;" 2d, 'all the misery of created things on man's account,' which again I consider as comprised in three particulars. Of these the first is, —'the miserable bondage of created things under sinful man;' the misery of which bondage is seen in two things: 1st, in their annoyance and fatigue, which God pities, and against which he has made provision in the fourth commandment, (Ex. xx. 10); 2dly, in their perversion to a different end from that for which they were created, and for which they were designed to be serviceable to man, (Hos. ii. 8.) The second particular is, the pollution of created things from the contagion of man's sin, under which pollution the creature suffers, and under which it groans, until it shall be purified by renewal with fire at the coming of the Lord, (2 Pet. iii. 10.) The third particular of this misery is, the various

changes of things, and the manifold judgments of God, which, along with sinful man, created things, serving man, undergo (Gen. iii. 17; iv. 11, 12.) All these four things, viz.:—man rendered vain by sin, the miserable bondage of created things under vain man, their pollution arising from the contagion of his vanity, and, in fine, the judgment of God, which, along with man, they undergo—all these things, I say, I consider as included under the name of this "vanity," to which the world has been made subject. "Not of its own accord, but on account of him who hath made it subject." The apostle has thus shewn us the first part of the condition of creation, viz.—'its subjection to vanity.' This he now goes on to illustrate by its efficient cause, which he sets forth under a contrast. 'Creation has been made subject to vanity, not of its own accord;' this is the first member of the contrast, and that which is said not to be the cause. "But on account of him who hath made it subject,"—this is the second member of the contrast, and that which is affirmed to be the cause. Therefore, that which is said not to be the cause of this subjection, is the nature itself of created things, which were made free from vanity, and which, of their own nature, would neither have obeyed man now fallen, nor have been miserable along with him; that again which is affirmed to be the cause, is the appointment of a long-suffering God, whose pleasure it is, on account of the elect who are to be called, that the world should be serviceable even to sinners, Matt. v. 45. Or it may be said that this illustration is taken from a contrast of ends—"not of its own accord," that is, 'not on its own account,' but "on account of him who hath made it subject (to vanity)," *i. e.*, 'for the use of man, who, by his sin, has plunged the world under vanity along with himself;' so that the meaning will be:—As the world was created at first for the use of man, and to be serviceable to him; so now that it has been subjected to vanity, that is, made vain, and subject to corruption through man's sin, it is yet preserved under this corruption, on account of the expected renewal of the same man, along with whom the world itself also shall be renewed, according as it is

written, 1 Cor. v. 17,—"Old things are passed away, behold all things have become new;" and again, 2 Pet. iii. 13,—"We look for new heavens and a new earth." The apostle therefore says,—that the world being preserved on account of elect men, groans under corruption, and is subject to vanity, longing for the liberty of the elect, that it may be restored to liberty along with them.'

21. "In hope that itself also shall be restored." This is the second part of the condition of creation, and an epanorthosis of the former—'Creation has been made subject to vanity, but in hope that itself also shall be restored.' Hope is here ascribed to created things anthropopathically, and after the manner of men to be saved; to the latter the hope of deliverance properly belongs, but also to created things metaphorically, since they shall participate with elect men in Christ Jesus in their deliverance. "From the bondage of corruption." He explains this hoped for deliverance of creatures from the subject *termini** *a quo*, and *ad quem*† of the deliverance. The *terminus a quo*, is "bondage" and "corruption;" *i. e.*—'miserable bondage on account of corruption, and the judgment upon corruption; in both of which created things are partakers along with man, while serving man in his sin.' "Into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God." The *terminus ad quem* is "liberty," which is explained, 1st, by its primary subject, "of the sons of God;" 2d, by the adjunct of its glory—it is 'glorious liberty from corruption, and the judgment upon corruption, through the righteousness of Christ,' which is called "glory," because it is glorious liberty, (Phil. iii. 20, 21.) And, as it primarily belongs to the sons of God, so, by participation with them in Christ, it belongs also secondarily to created things.

22. "For we know that the whole creation sigheth together and travaileth together, even unto this time." This is the second argument whereby he proves the antecedent, or that created things

* The extreme points betwixt which it ranges.

† The extreme point *from* which; and the extreme point to which.

are waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, from the pain and sorrow of created things, consequent upon their condition before described; the excess of this pain being illustrated by the similitudes of one sighing audibly, and of one in travail: then by the adjunct of the time, and its constant duration: 'Created things sigh, and are like a travailing woman, who anxiously longs for the period of her delivery, even unto the time of the revelation of the sons of God: 'Therefore, they wait with head thrust out for that revelation.'

23. "And not only they, but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, sigh within ourselves." Thus far we have had the common testimony of created things concerning the glory—to be revealed—of the sons of God. Next comes the proof of the second testimony, which is that of renewed man, or, as the apostle here speaks, 'of man having the first fruits of the Spirit;' for so the apostle here metaphorically describes our regeneration in this life, viz.—as "the first fruits," that is—"the beginning," and, so to speak, 'earliest products of the Holy Spirit, whose perfection or full harvest will follow, in another life, to all those who receive the first fruits in this.' This second testimony to the glory to be revealed is in like manner proved by the effects of the renewed, which are here set forth under a comparison of majority:—

'Not only other creatures, but even we ourselves who have been renewed, wait and sigh in hope of the glory that is to be revealed:

'Therefore we ourselves also are witnesses that it is to be revealed:'

And so he reasons in 2 Cor. v. 1, 2. "Waiting for the adoption, that is, the redemption of our body." This glory—to be revealed—of man having the first fruits of the Spirit, the apostle describes by its formal cause, which is,—'adoption,' and its subject-matter, to wit—'the redemption of our body." By "adoption," I understand here 'the full revelation concerning us that we are the sons of God;' for although we are already adopted, and the sons of

God, yet the apostle John, 1st Ep. iii. 2, says that "it is not yet manifest what we shall be:' our glory therefore remains concealed until such time as our adoption shall be revealed. The glory—to be revealed—of adoption, will be manifested, says the apostle, in "the redemption of our body;" where "the body" is put by synecdoche for 'the whole man:' he says the redemption of the *body* however rather than of the *soul*, because the redemption of the soul being already accomplished when the saints, as regards their souls, have departed to dwell with the Lord, yet this our adoption and glory is not yet fully manifested: but as soon as the redemption of the body shall have been accomplished by its resurrection from the dead, then for the first time shall be fully manifested both the adoption and glory of all those who are the sons of God, and who already have the first fruits of the Spirit of God. To this agree the words of the apostle John, 1st Ep. iii. 2, "we know that when he shall be manifested, we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is."

24. "For we are saved by hope." He proceeds to prove the last-mentioned effect, viz.—'that those who have the first fruits of the Spirit wait for the glory to be revealed.' The argument is taken from the instrumental cause of the salvation or glory to be revealed, thus:—

'We are saved by hope,' or 'hope is the instrumental cause and *sine qua non* of our attaining this glory:'

"Therefore those who have the first fruits of the Spirit, and are to be saved, wait for the full harvest and glory to be revealed."

"But hope, if it be seen, is not hope." From the foregoing proof that we are saved by hope, the apostle deduces, after the manner of a corollary, the principal conclusion of his digression announced in verse 17, viz.—that we ought to suffer with Christ, and to wait for the inheritance with patient endurance. The process of deduction is as follows:—

'If we do not see the salvation which we hope for, we ought to wait for it with patient endurance;

'But the former is true; we do not see the salvation which we wait for:

'Therefore we should wait for it with patient endurance.'

The proposition, which is hypothetical, is given in verse 25.

The assumption, viz.—'that hope, or the salvation hoped for, is not seen,' is proved in this 24th verse, thus:—

'Hope,' or the 'hoped for salvation,' for so I take the words to be here used by metonymy, 'if it be seen, is not hope:

'Therefore hope, or the hoped for salvation is not seen.'

The apostle's argument is drawn from the contradiction of hope, in the same way as he reasons farther on, chap. xi. 6, concerning "grace" and "work." The antecedent is proved from the frustration of the end:—

'If any one hope for that which he sees, his hope will be frustrated:

'Therefore hope, if it is seen, is not hope:'

And from this the apostle deduces his final conclusion—'Therefore we should wait for the salvation with patient endurance.'

26. "In like manner, the (Holy) Spirit also helpeth our weaknesses." We have here the third testimony, namely, that of the Holy Spirit witnessing in like manner, by his effect, to the glory —to be revealed—of the sons of God. The effect of the Holy Spirit in us, whereby this his testimony is proved, is—'the helping of our weaknesses.' Under the name of "weaknesses," I understand, according to the apostle's own interpretation in the subsequent vv.—'our unfitness both to wait with patient endurance for the promised inheritance in Jesus Christ, and to invoke the assistance of God, by which we may be enabled patiently to endure and hope for it:' for by mentioning the latter, when he says —"we know not what to pray for," the apostle presupposes the former, since we would not ask aid, unless we were weak in ourselves. The argument therefore runs thus:—

'The Holy Spirit himself helpeth our weaknesses, both as regards hoping for the glory to be revealed, and suffering in the hope

of that glory, as well as imploring divine aid, that we may not fail in hoping or suffering:

'Therefore, by helping our weaknesses, as regards waiting for the glory, he bears witness to that glory, that it is to be revealed.'

"For we know not what to pray for as we ought." He goes on to explain this effect of the Holy Spirit by a contrast, in the first member of which, as we have already hinted, our weakness is shewn by synecdoche. "But the Spirit himself intercedeth for us, with sighs unutterable." This is the second member of the contrast, wherein is shewn the assistance of the Holy Spirit, who helps our weaknesses, which assistance is—'his intercession for us;' which again is illustrated by the adjunct of the manner, he intercedeth—"with sighs unutterable." By this adjunct of the manner of interceding, the apostle would teach us two things. First, he would teach us that the sighs produced by the Holy Spirit of God in the sons of God themselves, often supply the want of utterance and prayer. Secondly, that these sighs of the Holy Spirit are unutterable, and that for two reasons: either because the inward sense of him who sighs surpasses utterance, so that it cannot be expressed in words; or, because the sighs of the Holy Spirit surpass the sense itself, and, consequently, the utterance also, of the individual sighing—as the apostle would intimate in the following verse, when he says, 'that the meaning of these sighs is known to God,' as if they often surpassed the comprehension both of angels and men, being understood by God alone.

27. "But he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the sense of the Spirit." We have here a prolepsis, in which an objection—arising from the foregoing mode of interceding for the saints, or rather from the aforesaid quality of the sighs wherewith the Spirit intercedes for the saints—is anticipated thus:—

'Sighs which are not comprehended nor understood, are useless to the individuals sighing, and of no avail in helping their weaknesses;

'But if the sighs of the Spirit are unutterable, then they are not comprehended nor understood:

'Therefore, if these sighs are unutterable, they are of no avail, and afford no relief to the saints.'

To this objection, the apostle replies by the negation of the assumption; and in the verse before us he adduces this reason for the negation, viz.—that God understands the sense of his own Spirit [interceding] on our behalf: wherefore, although these sighs are unutterable, and surpass, as we have just said, both the sense and speech of the creature; yet the apostle would have us know that they are comprehended by God. In proof of this, two arguments are here brought forward. The first is taken from the nature of God:

'God is acquainted with * and searcheth our hearts;

'Therefore, although the sighs are unutterable, yet God knows what is the sense of his Spirit in these sighs:'

This is therefore a consolation to those who, like the Psalmist, are so agitated with afflictions, that they cannot fully express themselves; but no excuse for such as mock God with an idiom which they do not understand, and by a designed and studied ignorance. "Because he intercedeth for the saints agreeably to God." This is the second argument by which the apostle proves that the sense of the Spirit in the unutterable sighs of the pious is not only known to God, but also owned by him; that is—'that these sighs of the saints, proceeding from his own Spirit, are grateful and acceptable to him.' The argument is taken from the adjunct of the intercession by means of these sighs: it is κατὰ Θεὸν, that is—'conformable to the will of God.' The apostle accordingly thus reasons:—

All intercession, in whatever manner it is made, whether by words or sighs, if it be made agreeably to the will of God, (κατὰ Θεὸν) is comprehended by God, yea owned by and acceptable to him;

'But this intercession of the Spirit in our behalf,' he subjoins

* Καρδιογνώστης.

by way of assumption, 'is conformable to the will of God (κατὰ Θεὸν):

'Therefore, although made only with sighs, and these unutterable, the Lord knows and accepts it;'

In which sense the word "know" is used in Ps. i. 6; Matt. vii. 23.

28. "For we know that all things work together for good to those that love God." This is the second argument by which the apostle encourages those who are joint heirs with Christ to suffer with him, that they may be glorified together with him. As we have formerly observed in our remarks on verse 18, this second argument is borrowed from the end or issue of the sufferings to which the sons of God are subject; and this end or issue is declared to be the same as that of all those things which happen to them in this life,—'the suffering of them turns out for the good of those that suffer.' The apostle, therefore, thus reasons:—

'Afflictions, like all other things, work together for good to those who are joint heirs with Christ:

'Therefore those who are joint heirs with Christ should gladly suffer with him, that they may get good to themselves, and also be glorified together with him.'

The antecedent, which is contained in this 28th verse, is established by the common testimony of the pious,—"We know," says the apostle, and amplified by a description of those to whom all things thus work for good, a description consisting of two parts. The first part is the effect of faith in them, viz.—'the holy love wherewith they love God according to the commandment of the first table of the law.' "To those (namely) who are the called according to his purpose." This, the second part of the description, is the adjunct of 'the calling of God,' whereby they have been called to grace; and this 'calling' again is illustrated by its cause and foundation, which is 'the purpose of God.' The purpose (προθέσιν) of God I here take to be identical with that which the same apostle in Ephes. i. 2, denominates,—"the bene-

volent affection of the will of God" (εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ); which, as the apostle seems here to intimate by deducing the calling from the purpose, is the second foundation of all the spiritual benefits which the Lord confers upon us in Christ. For he first foreknows in Christ; foreknowledge, accordingly, is the first foundation in the following 29th verse: then comes this εὐδοκία τοῦ θελήματος or purpose (πρόθεσις) of God, agreeably to his foreknowledge; according to which, as a second foundation, God predestinates, calls, justifies and glorifies us. All this, as I have said, is implied in the mention by the apostle of that one benefit; so that when he says that we are "called according to his purpose," he seems, I say, at the same time, to intimate, that we are predestinated according to the same purpose, justified according to the purpose of God, and glorified according to that purpose; the more especially since, in the passage in Ephesians referred to, he says, that God has 'predestinated us according to this benevolent affection of his will.'

29. "For whom he foreknew he also predestinated to be conformed to the image of his son, that he may be the first born among many brethren.

30. "Moreover whom he predestinated, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." The foregoing antecedent, viz., 'that all things work together for good to those who love God, and are the called according to his purpose,' having thus far been established by the common testimony of the pious, as we have remarked upon the preceding verse, is again proved by the apostle in these two verses. The argument whereby he proves it is taken from the adjunct of the indissoluble connection of the benefits which are conferred upon us by God, according to his purpose, with the divine foreknowledge (προγνώσει); and is stated in the prosyllogistic form thus:—

'All things work together for good to those whom God glori-

fies;' this, which is the proposition, is obvious, because 'the glory to be revealed' is the felicity and supreme good of man, and because all intermediate things turn out for good to those to whom this is allotted as the termination of their troubles: hence the apostle subjoins the assumption,—'But God glorifies those who were foreknown:

'Therefore all things turn out for good to those who were foreknown.'

The assumption is here the point to be settled, and is proved from the immediate effect of the foreknowledge of God, or his purpose agreeably to that foreknowledge: this effect is 'predestination,' which is also the more remote cause to men of their glorification or highest good. The syllogism by which it is proved runs thus:—

'God glorifies all who were predestinated to life;

'But he predestinated all who were foreknown:

'Therefore whom he foreknew he glorifies;'

Which is the assumption of the first syllogism. The assumption of this last syllogism, 'God predestinated those whom he foreknew,' is given in the commencement of verse 29, and illustrated in the remainder of the verse by the twofold end of predestination, viz.: the proximate, which is—'our conformity to the image of his Son, first in the cross, and then in the kingdom,—first in patient endurance, and afterwards in glory;' and the more remote, which is,—'that Jesus Christ may be "the first-born," (πρωτότοκος,) that is, the first and forerunner, "among many brethren," in each of the aforesaid particulars, namely, in patient endurance and glory, in the cross and kingdom.' The assumption of the last syllogism, viz.—'that God predestinated those who were foreknown,' being thus established, the proposition, namely, 'that God glorifies those who were predestinated,' remains as the point to be settled: this the apostle proves, in the following words, from the immediate effect of predestination, which is,—'our effectual calling to grace;' and he proves it as follows:—

'God glorifies all whom he calls;'

'But God calls in time, all whom he predestinated before time;
'Therefore he glorifies all whom he predestinated;'

Which is the proposition of the preceding syllogism. The assumption of this last syllogism is given by the apostle in the beginning of verse 30; the proposition, viz., 'that God glorifies those who are called,' remains as the point to be settled: this the apostle proves from the immediate effect of the calling, which is the second benefit of God in time, namely, 'our justification;' and he does so in this way:—

'God glorifies all whom he justifies;
'But he justifies all whom he calls:
'Therefore he also glorifies all whom he calls;'

Which was the proposition of the syllogism immediately preceding. Each of the premises of this last syllogism is given by the Apostle in the remainder of the 30th v.; but, by hysterosis, the assumption is placed first, in the middle of the verse—'he justifies those whom he calls;' and the proposition, consisting of immediate terms,* for righteousness is the proximate and immediate cause of our glorification with Christ—follows, at the close of the verse. Wherefore, since the first proposition—'All things turn out for good to those whom God glorifies'—is immediate,† as has been already shewn, and the proof of the first assumption—'God glorifies those whom he foreknew'—has been reduced to the proximate and immediate cause, the conclusion—'all things turn out for good to those whom God foreknew, and has called according to His purpose'—which was the antecedent of the enthymeme, follows from premises which are both immediate. We see, therefore, that 'foreknowledge,‡ and 'predestination' which are eternal benefits of God, and antecedent to time, are united by an indissoluble connection, as the apostle here testifies, with 'calling' which is a benefit in time; just as 'calling' itself is united by an indis-

* Terms between which there is no middle term; or which do not require to be compared, by means of a syllogism, with any third term.

† *i. e.* A proposition whose terms are immediate. (See *.)

‡ Προγνώσις.

soluble connection with the 'righteousness' and 'glory' that follow: so that by reason of that indissoluble connection, we have here a truly golden chain, from any one of the benefits included in which we may infer the rest, one by one; and so from all or any one of them, we may conclude that all things turn out for good to the man who is a partaker thereof, as we have just seen the apostle doing, when he asserts that—"all things work together for good to those who are the called according to his purpose."

31. "What shall we say, therefore, to these things? If God be for us, who is against us?" We come now to the third section of the chapter, and the conclusion of the leading syllogism, which is first stated generally in vv. 31, 32, and then explained by its parts in the remaining verses to the end of the chapter. The general conclusion, deduced from what has gone before is this—'there is no one against us,' *i.e.* 'against any of us who are Christ's;' the deduction being marked by the illative particle "therefore." This conclusion is embellished in these two verses by an anacoenosis embracing two interrogations: the first—"What shall we say to these things?" the second—"Who is against us?" In each of these the hypophora or subjoined reply is—'We must say that there is no one against us,' or 'we have no cause to fear any one that is against us;' which reply, although here omitted, or rather implied in the second interrogation, is frequently expressed in the Psalms, as in Ps. cxviii. 6, 7, and many others. The import of this hypophora or reply is not—that the pious have no adversaries; since, on the contrary, the apostle testifies in Eph. vi. 12, and following verses, that "we wrestle not (only) against flesh and blood, but against spiritual wickednesses," compared with which flesh and blood might be accounted nothing: but the meaning of the conclusion is—that although the pious have many foes,—the flesh, the world and the devil—yet none of their foes shall prevail over them to hurt them; so that the pious and those that are heirs of God in Jesus Christ may despise all their foes, and all those that are against them, as the Psalmist explains it in Ps. cxviii. 6. Two

arguments are deduced in support of this general conclusion, viz., that no adversary shall prevail over the saints: the first is that which occurs so often in the Psalms, drawn from the adjunct of the presence of God:—'God is for all of us who are in Christ Jesus:

'Therefore no one who is against us,' or 'no adversary shall prevail over us.'

32. "He who spared not his own son, but delivered him up for us all." This is the second argument for the general conclusion, taken from the act of God in delivering up his son to death for us; from which, as the greater, the apostle here reasons, and concludes—that all other things as the less shall be bestowed on us by God in his son Jesus Christ. The reasoning is to this effect:—'God delivered up his son for us: Therefore with him he will not only grant us defence against our foes, but will give us all things in the son, who was delivered up for us.' The antecedent, which is given in the beginning of this 32d verse, is illustrated by a contrast:—'He spared not his son, but delivered him up to death for us;' and by the adjunct of the son, who was delivered up—'he was God's *own* Son,' that is, 'by birth, and only begotten,' not his adopted or factitious son, like us who are in Christ Jesus. "How shall he not also with him freely bestow upon us all things?" The consequent of the enthymeme is amplified by a twofold comparison of majority, and by the adjunct of the manner. The first comparison of majority is—'He who delivered up his son for us, will much more grant us in his son defence against our foes;' the second comparison is—That he who gave his son will not only grant us defence against our foes, but over and above that, will give us all things in his son; the adjunct of the manner of giving is—'that he will give freely,' or 'that what he gives us he will bestow upon us freely in his son.'

33. "Who shall bring charges against God's elect?" Next comes the explication of the conclusion by its parts: of these,

three are here enumerated as so many species of opp ne of which shall prevail against the pious, and those for whom Christ was delivered up to death. Those who oppose themselves to, and are the adversaries of the pious, oppose themselves in three ways, either by accusing, condemning, or executing. The first species and part of this opposition, therefore, is, 'accusation,' and is contained in verse 33; the second, ascending by auxesis,* or by a climax, is 'condemnation,' in verse 34; the third is the 'execution' of the other two, both accusation and condemnation, and consists in our separation from the love of Christ, being contained in the 35th and following verses. Each of these parts is embellished by anacoenosis. The interrogation of the first anacoenosis is, "Who shall bring charges against God's elect?" The hypophora of this interrogation, which is omitted, or, as we said, [of the last example of this figure], implied in the question itself, is this, 'that no one shall bring charges against God's elect,' the import of which, in like manner, is not that there is no accuser of the brethren, or of believers,—for the *devil*† is so named from this very effect, and is denominated "the accuser of the brethren," in Rev. xii. 10,—but the meaning is, 'that although there be many who accuse God's elect, yet the accusation of none, whether angels or wicked men, shall prevail against the elect.' "It is God that justifieth." This is the proof of the foregoing reply, 'that no accusation shall prevail against the elect,' taken from the contrary, viz., 'the justification of God,' and runs thus:—

'No accusation of any one bringing charges against those whom God justifies, shall prevail;

'But God justifies the elect:

'Therefore no accusation shall prevail against the elect.'

34. "Who is he that condemneth?" This is the second part of the conclusion, and the second species of opposition, embellished in like manner by anacoenosis, and the answer to which is also

* Amplification. † Greek, διάβολος, from διαβαλλω, 'to accuse.'

implied in the interrogation, viz., 'No one shall condemn the elect of God,' or, 'there is therefore no condemnation to me, nor to any one who, being in Christ with me through faith, is certain of his election;' and in this one part of the conclusion, the genus itself of the general syllogism,* viz., 'that there is *no one against me* who am in Christ, and engrafted into Him through faith'—is indicated by synecdoche. "It is Christ that died; yea, more, who is also risen again, who is even at the right hand of God." The arguments for the reply are two. Of these, the first is taken from the adjunct of the 'humiliation' and 'glory' of Jesus Christ, of which glory two parts are here enumerated: 'his glorious resurrection,' and 'his glorious sitting at the right hand of God.' The argument therefore runs thus:—

'Christ died for the elect'—this is his humiliation—'to make an end of their sins, and was glorified for their justification;' for he rose again, and sat down at the right hand of God:

'Therefore no one shall be able to condemn the elect,' or, 'there is no condemnation to the elect;'

So that those of us who, through faith on Jesus Christ, are certain of the effect of our election, are also, each of us, certain of future salvation, and that there is to us no condemnation. "Who also intercedeth for us." The highest step in this climax, and the second argument, from the effect of Christ dead and glorified, is 'his continual intercession, in heaven, with God for us, by the virtue of his own merits, as our only advocate;' for we are not to suppose that Christ still acts as a suppliant with the Father, as in the days of his flesh, since he is now glorified, and, as the apostle here testifies, sits at the Father's right hand; but he now intercedes for us, and acts as our advocate, by the perpetual display, in God's sight, of his own satisfaction, which is ever new, and ever amply pleads for all the sins of all who are covered with that satisfaction, even with the righteousness of Him who died and rose again. The apostle therefore thus reasons:—

* See on verses 1. and 31.

'No one shall be able to condemn those for whom Christ intercedes and acts as advocate in heaven with the Father;

'But Christ intercedes and acts as advocate, in heaven with the Father, for us who are elect, and for each of us:

'Therefore no one shall be able to condemn us who are elect.'

35. "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" The third part of the conclusion is in like manner amplified by anacoenosis, the interrogation of which, contained in verses 35, 36, is twofold. The first interrogation is generic and general, concerning every adversary 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?' By "love," I understand here, primarily and chiefly, 'that wherewith Christ holds us dear;' secondarily, and by consequence, also 'that wherewith we love Christ our Saviour;' for although hypocrites, and those who pretend to the love of Christ, are discovered in their own time, and separated from the love of Christ,—that is, are made manifest that they do not love Christ,—and although the elect themselves have their falls, by which, for a season, they stumble against that love, yet, as by the intercession of Jesus Christ their faith fails not, (as we read of Peter,) so neither does the love and affection wherewith they love Christ. The import of this interrogation, therefore, is, 'Who shall be able to sever us from Jesus Christ? who shall be able to effect either that he himself should not love the elect, or that those who have been redeemed by him should not love him in return, from a powerful sense in themselves of his love?' "Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?" This is the second and particular interrogation relating to those things which, in particular, oppose themselves to the elect, and threaten to separate them from the love of Christ; these are the manifold afflictions and evils of this life, of which seven species are here enumerated.

36. "(As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter)." We have,

in these words, the reason why, to the general interrogation, he has added a particular one concerning the evils of life, which is taken from the adjunct of our condition in the present life, viz., 'that we are subject to all these evils;' as if he had spoken or reasoned thus:—

'In the present life we are subject to tribulation, distress, persecution, and the other evils enumerated;

'And therefore I have proposed the question—Whether tribulation, distress, persecution, or the other evils enumerated, shall be able to separate us from that love?'

The apostle proves the antecedent in this parenthesis by the testimony of the Prophet, out of Psalms xliv. 22.

37. "Nay in all these things we are more than conquerors." This is the hypophora, or subjoined reply, which, like the interrogation itself, is also twofold: one, in which he replies to the general question, 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?' another, in which he replies to the question concerning the evils in particular, 'Shall tribulation, &c. separate us from the love of Christ?' but, by hysterosis, the general reply is given after the particular. In this and the preceding verse, the apostle replies to the particular question by a tacit contrast:—'It is true these things try to separate us from Christ, but in every such trial we come off conquerors.' The latter member of the contrast is illustrated in two ways. First he illustrates it by a comparison of majority:—'We come off, not only conquerors, but more than conquerors;' which the apostle asserts on account of the increase within us, from our afflictions, both of a most delightful sense of the love wherewith Christ loves us, and of the love wherewith we ourselves love Him: so that the meaning is—'The afflictions and evils of this life not only do not separate us from Jesus Christ, but unite us more closely, every day, in mutual love, and daily work an increase both of a most delightful sense of his love toward us, and of the love therefrom resulting, wherewith we love him in return.' "Through him that loved us." Secondly, he illustrates the reply

and latter member of the contrast by the efficient cause of our victory in every evil and affliction; for although we are united with Christ in mutual love more closely every day, by our afflictions, yet it is not our afflictions which work that increase, but it is Christ that loves us, who, by his Spirit, both works in us a sense of his love towards us, and therefrom effects that we should love him, by sanctifying our afflictions for this end: otherwise, the nature of these is, to separate the natural man * from God, as the Prophet teaches us in Ps. lxxiii. 21, 22, by his experience of the remains of the flesh within him.

38. "For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor men, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come,"

39. "Nor height, nor depth, nor any other created thing, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Jesus Christ our Lord."

This is the second and general reply answering to the general interrogation in v. 35—'who shall separate us from the love of Christ?' To that question an answer is here returned, and the substance of it is—'no created thing shall separate us from the love of God in Christ.' In these two verses the reply is first proved, and then variously amplified. The argument whereby it is proved is taken from the adjunct of the persuasion of the apostle—'I am persuaded that no created thing shall separate us from the love of God; and the apostle here states this persuasion, not as his own and peculiar to himself, but as an example to others, and as that in which each professor of the faith, provided he be a genuine professor, ought, as the apostle here intimates, to imitate him; so that the meaning is—'I am persuaded concerning myself, and after my example, all who with me are genuine believers ought to be persuaded, each concerning himself, that no created thing shall sepa-

* φυσικὸν ἄνθρωπον.

rate us from the love of God.' By this the apostle would teach us, that that is not Christian faith which goes no farther than common knowledge, but that which individually applies the grace known in common, and embraces it with the full persuasion (πληροφορια) of the apostle. Thus far the proof; next comes the amplification of the reply, which consists of three parts; for he first illustrates created things, concerning which he denies that they shall separate us from the love of God; secondly, he illustrates the negation of the separation; and, thirdly, the love from which he denies that creatures shall separate us. As regards the first, he amplifies created things by an induction of general and things directly opposed to each other, such as are; either 'death,' and those evils which threaten death,' or 'life and those blessings which are subservient to life;' then, 'things present,' or 'things to come;' thirdly, 'things high,' or 'things deep;' in fine, he enumerates, as the leaders of all these hosts of foes and things adverse to us—'the fallen angels with their principality and power' over "the darkness of this world," or, as he himself interprets the expression, 'the children of disobedience and unbelief.' Against all these created things and genera of created things, the apostle glories that they shall not separate him from Jesus Christ; and teaches that those who are genuine believers should each copy him in this glorying. The second amplification is, that of the negation of the separation, which is amplified by a comparison of minority: 'not only shall created things not separate us, but they shall not even be able to separate us from the love of God.' The last illustration is that of the love itself, from which the apostle denies that he can be separated by the attempts or power of any created thing; and he illustrates it by its subject, to wit—'Jesus Christ,' in whom God holds us dear, and in whom alone any one of men can love God.

CHAPTER IX.

"Next comes the destructive reasoning and refutation of those arguing for the people of the law: For as the former destructive reasoning, from the 20th ver. of chap. v. to chap. viii., was a refutation of those that argued for the law against faith; so is the present destructive reasoning a refutation of those arguing for the people of the law against grace, wherein the apostle obviates the offence of the gospel arising from the opposition of the Jews, who were the people of God and the visible Church. The following, therefore, seems to be the form which the objection would take:

'If this, which you announce, were the way of salvation, and there were no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, then the Church of God, which is the nation of the Jews, would have embraced this way.' This proposition, the opponents seem to have founded upon the privileges of that people, enumerated in verses 4 and 5 following, but especially upon the last-mentioned prerogative, whereby Christ is said to have descended from the Jews; for how should others not reject that Saviour whom 'his own do not receive?' So Pilate reasoned, John xviii. 35; and so the Gentiles, who opposed the gospel, seem here to object to Paul, subjoining for the assumption:—

'But the nation of the Jews reject this way;

'Therefore this is not the true way of salvation, nor is there freedom from condemnation through Christ.'

Or, if you prefer it, the objection may be thus deduced, enthymematically:—

'The Jews, who are the people of God, and the visible Church for whom the law was ordained, to whom the promises were given, who are themselves descended from the fathers, and from whom Christ descended—reject this way of salvation'—as the unbelieving Jews at Rome afterwards openly objected, (Acts xxviii. 22:)

'Therefore this way of salvation which you announce is not the true way, nor are those who are in Christ Jesus free from condemnation.'"

To this objection and offence arising from the opposition of the Jews, the apostle replies in these three chapters, ix. x. xi; and his reply consists of two parts: for first of all he admits the antecedent of the enthymeme or assumption of the syllogism, viz.—'that the Jews speak against the gospel, and by speaking against it are the occasion of offence to the Gentiles;' secondly, he denies the consequence of the enthymeme, or hypothetical proposition of the syllogism, namely,—'that on that account, or because of the offence of which the Jews are the occasion, the way of salvation which he had announced is not the true way, or that those who are engrafted in Christ through faith are not free from condemnation.' The first part of the reply, or the granting of the antecedent, is given in the first five verses; after which he prosecutes the second part, viz.—'that the offence occasioned by the apostate Jews detracts nothing from his gospel.' The apostle does not expressly state the first part of his reply, or his confession concerning the opposition of the Jews, in these first five verses, but only intimates it by its effect; which effect of the apostacy of the Jews who rejected the gospel is the adjunct of the apostle's grief, or his great sorrow and continual anguish of mind, as he himself speaks, on account of that apostacy of his people, and their rejection of the truth as it is in Christ; for in this way he both convicts them of speaking against it, and in the meantime avoids offending those who thus contradicted, by ingratiating himself with them through a display of his grief on account of their wickedness. This grief and continual anguish of his he proves by two arguments.

1. "I say the truth by Christ; I lie not." The first argument of the proof is taken from a twofold testimony. The one is that of Christ set forth by contraries,—'I say the truth; I lie not; Christ is my witness that I have great sorrow on account of the Jews:' this first testimony, therefore, is equivalent to an oath; for to swear is nothing else than to call God to witness that we speak the truth. "My conscience also bearing me witness,"

The second testimony whereby he proves this, viz.—'that he is grieved on account of the Jews who opposed themselves to Christ, is that of his own conscience. "By the Holy Spirit." Inasmuch as this latter testimony, namely, that of his own conscience, is the very point to be determined, and equally obscure with the conclusion itself, he establishes it by a second oath, and calls the indwelling spirit of God to be a witness to his conscience; for when the conscience is said to "bear witness in" or "by the Holy Spirit," the meaning is—'that the Holy Spirit is a witness to us that we do not lie when we adduce the testimony of our own conscience;' unless you would rather say that the apostle illustrates the testimony of his conscience by the efficient cause, both of the testimony itself and of the grief concerning which conscience bears witness, in which case the sense will be:—'Conscience is my witness that I grieve exceedingly on account of the apostate Jews; and that which produces within me this grief and the testimony of conscience concerning it is not the flesh, but the Spirit of God dwelling in me.'

2. "That I have great sorrow and continual anguish in my heart." The consequent of the enthymeme, or his grief, deduced from the twofold testimony already mentioned, is here amplified by its subject,—'it is not in the countenance and external, but internal, and in the heart.' By this the apostle would indicate both the sincerity and vehemence of his grief; for grief, which has its seat in the heart, is both more vehement and always sincere, whilst, on the contrary, that which lies no deeper than the countenance is nothing better than a pretence.

3. "I could wish that I myself were anathema from Christ." The second argument by which he proves the anguish of his heart on account of the apostacy of Israel is taken from the adjunct of his wish or desire, whereby, like Moses under the law, (Exod. xxxii. 32,) so he himself under the gospel, with holy zeal, prefers his brethren, or rather the glory of God in the salvation of his

brethren to himself, so that he wished to become anathema, if by that means they might be gained over to Christ. The word "anathema" properly signifies 'a thing laid up, or set apart and separated;' and is used in the Word of God both in a good and in a bad sense. Thus in Lev. xxvii. 28, "every devoted thing" (חרם) is said to be "holy to Jehovah:" and the same thing is frequently to be met with in other places, as in Numb. xviii. 14, where the food of the priests, of which it was not lawful for the unclean to eat, and which was consecrated to Jehovah, is called "a devoted thing" (ἀνάθεμα); and in Josh. vi. 20 [17], where the same epithet is applied to the city Jericho, which was wholly separated to Jehovah from the people, either to be burnt with fire or to serve Jehovah's uses; so in Judges xiii. 5, Sampson is spoken of as "separated (נזיר) unto God." But we have a most manifest example of a different acceptation of the term in Josh. vi. 21, according to the division of Tremellius,* where Joshua says to the people,—"keep yourselves from the anathema, lest ye make yourselves anathema." The people of Israel were sacred to God and separated from the Gentiles; and the city Jericho having been already consecrated to God becomes anathema, and is separated from the use of the people of Israel; the people, therefore, are commanded to beware of every thing in that city, lest if any one should touch that which was "anathema," 'a thing separated to Jehovah,' he should render himself with the army of Israel "anathema"—'a thing separated,' not to God, but 'from God.' There is, therefore, an anathema '*to* God,' and an anathema '*from* God:' a Nazarite, or one who is consecrated to God, is—ἀνατιθέμενος, 'separated to God;' and one who is accursed from God is called—ἀνάθεμα, 'separated from God.'" The apostle, therefore, to avoid this ambiguity of the term, says not merely—"I could wish that I were anathema," but—"I could wish that I were anathema from Christ:"† this he illustrates from its end, by adding—"for my brethren," and reasons thus:—

'I could wish that I were anathema from Christ for my breth-

* V. 18. Eng. vers. † 'Απὸ Χριστοῦ.

ren,' that is, 'for their restoration to salvation and Christ, from opposing themselves to the gospel by speaking against it.

'Therefore I have very great sorrow because of that opposition, whereby they both perish themselves, and are the occasion of offence to the Gentiles that they should not believe the truth.'

The antecedent is given in the text, amplified by a definition of those brethren for whom he wishes to become anathema, who are here described by three adjuncts. For first of all these brethren are the "relatives" of Paul, and this relationship is illustrated by its subject-matter:—they are his "relatives," not according to the spirit, as Timothy and Titus are denominated his "sons;" for they would not in that case have furnished matter for grief, but they are his relatives "according to the flesh;" where by "flesh" I understand not 'corruption,' as after previously in this epistle, but 'stock and race,' or 'descent from the same fathers in the flesh.' From this the apostle leaves us to learn, that although those who are partakers of salvation in Christ should sorrow for all who are hastening to destruction, yet blood-relationship should increase that sorrow the more if those who are so related to us reject the truth and the salvation which is in Christ.

4. "Who are Israelites." This is the second part of the description of the brethren of Paul, taken from the adjunct of their designation, which has its origin in the former adjunct, viz.—'their relationship to him according to the flesh:—'I could wish,' says the apostle, 'to become anathema for my brethren; and by my brethren I mean those who, on account of their relationship to me, according to the flesh, are denominated Israelites, from our common parent, Jacob or Israel.' "Whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the constitution of the law, and the service, and the promises.

5. "Whose are the fathers, and from whom, as regard the flesh, is Christ, who is above all, God to be blessed for ever, Amen." The third part of the description of the brethren of Paul is taken

from the adjunct of the various prerogatives of the Israelitish people, by which they were hitherto distinguished above all the Gentiles, and on account of which especially the apostle has expressed such a wish; because his brethren by their abuse of them, and especially by their rejection of Christ, not only deprived themselves of the advantages of so great prerogatives, but were besides a greater stumbling-block to others in proportion to the greatness of the privileges which they formerly enjoyed; for when apostates have been previously enriched with great gifts and prerogatives they occasion great offence, and are a source of great sorrow to the godly. This the apostle here teaches, both on account of the *abuse* of the gifts, and because the offence given to the ungodly was increased by the *excellence* of the gifts. Of these prerogatives heretofore peculiar to the Israelites, six are here enumerated by the apostle. The first is "adoption;" by which I understand—'the election of this people before all the nations to be the people of God,' (Deut. x. 15,) and in reference to which, God calls the people of Israel his "first-born," (Exod. iv. 22, 23.) The second prerogative is here styled "the glory;" under which title I understand—'the ark of the covenant,' which in 1 Sam. iv. 22, is called "the glory," because it was the visible token of the presence of God among that people, whereby they were a glorious people, and excelled every other people on the earth. The third prerogative is—'the giving of a threefold law, the moral, the judicial, and the ceremonial.' The first of these, or 'the moral law,' the apostle here denominates—"the covenants," because it contains the condition of the covenant of works, (Gal. iii. 12;) and he says, "covenants" in the plural, not 'covenant,' because the violation of any one precept is a violation of the whole condition, (James ii. 10,) just as if the several precepts of the moral law were so many covenants or conditions of the covenant of works, all of which, if any one did not fully perform, he could look for nothing from that covenant but the ban and curse of the law—"cursed is every one who hath not continued in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them," (Gal. iii. 10.) 'The judicial law' is here

styled—"the constitution of the law,"(νομοθεσία) because through it the Israelitish state was constituted by God as its king. The third or 'ceremonial law' is called "the service," (λατρεία) or 'ministry,' because in its observance and practice, a great part, not to say the whole, of the external and typical ministry carried on among that people consisted. The fourth prerogative of Israel is —"the promises," which that people alone of all the nations possessed, (Eph. ii. 12;) under the name of which promises, I understand—'the word of faith and of the covenant of grace,' which having been promised to Israel "in divers manners," (Heb. i. 1,) was at length fully made manifest in the gospel. The fifth prerogative is that they were descended from those fathers—Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—who were beloved of God, and with whom he entered into covenant, (Deut. x. 15.) The last and most distinguished prerogative of this people is—'that from them was Christ;" and this prerogative is amplified by an explanation both of Christ, and of his descent from Israel. By hysterosis, his descent is first of all explained by its subject which is his "flesh," or 'human nature;' so that Christ was descended from Israel, not as regarded his whole person, as these opponents, knowing nothing of his divine nature, imagined, but in part only, and as regarded his other nature. The second part of the illustration, or the description of Christ himself, is taken, first of all, from that nature of his of which the unbelieving were ignorant:—he is the one "God," and the same God with his Father and the Holy Spirit; secondly, from his glory, which is explained from the less, by a comparison with that of creatures—he is "to be blessed above all;" thirdly, from the eternity both of himself and of his glory "for ever," and lastly, from an expression of approbation or a confession of faith on him, which is here indicated by the particle "Amen."

With this description of Jesus Christ at the close of the 5th verse, commences the second part of the apostle's reply to the leading objection, which has been stated under verse 1. The apostle, therefore, replies in the second place, to that objection, by denying the consequence of the enthymeme, or proposition of the

hypothetical syllogism, viz., that the way of righteousness and life through faith on Jesus Christ which he has announced to them, should not be rejected by the Gentiles as not the true way, because the Jews reject it, and everywhere speak against Christ. The negation itself of the consequence is indeed suppressed to avoid offending the Jews, with that prudence which we have already seen manifested by the apostle in the first part of his reply; but four reasons for the negation are adduced by the apostle. Of these the first is here given at the close of ver. 5; the second in the 6th and succeeding verses, as far as ver. 24; the third occupies the remainder of this chapter; the fourth and last is contained in the two following chapters, x. xi. The words in which the first reason of the negation of the consequence are expressed are these —"from whom, as regards the flesh, is Christ, who is above all, God to be blessed for ever, Amen;" whence the apostle thus reasons:—

'Jesus Christ, of whom ye say that he was descended from the Jews, and who is from the Jews according to the flesh, through whom I announce righteousness and life, is God to be blessed above all for ever; to which the elect of God say Amen:

'Therefore, although the Jews reject this way of salvation, it does not follow that it ought to be rejected as not the true way, but, on the contrary, as I announce, that there is no condemnation to those who are in Christ.'

My reason for taking this view of the passage is the uniform practice of the apostle, who never brings forward descriptions of Christ unless such as are exceedingly apposite and subservient to his present purpose: of this we had an example above, in the 25th ver. of chap. iv., where, in his discussion concerning righteousness through faith, he in like manner presented us with an apodictic argument, when defining Christ from his death and glory, or glorious resurrection; so here the apostle thus reasons, in full syllogism, if you choose:—

'If Jesus Christ, whom the Jews reject, be "God to be blessed above all for ever," and if by believing on him the elect are saved,

then is faith on him, and consequently himself apprehended by faith, the true way of righteousness and salvation, in spite of his rejection by the Jews;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore, so is also the latter.'

The proposition is self-evident, and such as cannot be contradicted, even the Jews themselves being judges, for they crucified the Lord of glory, because he said that he was the Son of God (John xix. 7); by which deed, although most criminal, they yet shewed that they would have embraced him themselves, if they had believed his testimony and what the apostle here testifies concerning him, viz.—that he is the only-begotten Son of God, and, consequently, "God to be blessed above all for ever." The proposition, therefore, being omitted as obvious, the assumption is here given by the apostle at the close of the 5th verse; whence follows the conclusion, which is the second part of the apostle's reply, viz.—'that Christ apprehended by faith is righteousness and life to those who believe on him, notwithstanding the rejection of this way of life by the Jews.'

6. "It is impossible, however, that the word of God hath failed." He proceeds now to the second reason for the negation of the consequence, which is to the following effect:—

'The true Israelites, those, namely, to whom, according to the purpose of God, the internal grace of adoption, &c., belong, do not reject this way of salvation through Jesus Christ:

'Therefore, although those Israelites who are only Israelites externally, reject the salvation which I have announced through faith in Christ, yet that salvation should not be rejected, nor ought their rejection of it to be an occasion of offence to any one.'

The antecedent, which is itself omitted, is thus proved from the adjunct of the "immutability," as the apostle calls it, in Heb. vi. 18, of the word of God:—

'The word of God has not failed:

'Therefore those who are true Israelites, or those to whom the

promises, with the other prerogatives which we have enumerated, have been effectually given, do not reject the salvation through Jesus Christ long before promised, and now fully made manifest.' The antecedent is given in the commencement of this 6th verse, amplified by a comparison of minority:—'the word of God not only has not failed, but it cannot be that it has failed.' The consequent is omitted, but, being sufficiently obvious from the antecedent, gives rise to three prolepses. "For they are not all Israel that are of Israel, (as their father)." This is the first prolepsis and prevention of objection:—'According to your opinion, therefore,' the adversaries might object, 'all Israelites are not true Israelites; but some are Israelites in truth, others in name only:' this the opponents assume to be absurd, and consequently reject, as good for nothing, the foregoing reply of the apostle, founded upon a distinction between different descriptions of Israelites. The apostle replies to the objection by denying the assumption, and maintaining that it is not only not absurd or paradoxical, but, on the contrary, most certain that all "who are of Israel" as their father, that is, 'who are descended from Israel according to the flesh,' are not "Israel," or 'that people of God to whom the enjoyment of the promises belongs.' This reply is contained in the remainder of the verse; and although it is only a repetition of what the apostle had more explicitly stated concerning the Jews in the 28th and 29th verses of chap. ii., yet inasmuch as it appears paradoxical and absurd to these opponents, arguing for the people of the law, that there should be any one "of Israel" who is not also Israel in truth, he enlarges upon the proof of this reply.

7. "Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they (therefore) all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called." The argument by which he proves it is taken from an induction of similar examples, of which there are two. The first is that of the house of Abraham, from which the apostle reasons, as is usually done, and ought always to be done in the case of extended examples, by a threefold process. For, first of all, he deduces

from the example a general proposition, which is, and is commonly called the proposition of the syllogism of the example, the argument being from species to genus; proceeding next from this general proposition, he deduces therefrom, in full syllogism, a conclusion similar to the third, or another particular case, the argument being from genus to species; and thirdly, proceeding from first to last, and arguing from the like, he infers the one particular case from the other, *e.g.*:

'All those who are "the seed of Abraham," that is, who are begotten of Abraham according to the flesh, are not also "children," or those to whom the covenant made by God with Abraham belongs; but "in Isaac," says the Lord to Abraham, Gen. xxi. 12, "shall thy seed be called:"

'Therefore those who are the children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned for the seed.'

The antecedent, set forth under a contrast, is given in this 7th verse.

8. "That is, those who are the children of the flesh are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned for the seed." This is the consequent of the enthymeme and proposition of the syllogism of the example, also set forth under a contrast. By "the children of the flesh" here I understand,—'those who,' as it is expressed in John i. 13, "are born of flesh and blood," that is, 'are born by the power of nature,' as was Ishmael from Hagar the bondmaid; by "the children of the promise" again, I understand—'those who,' in the language of the passage referred to, 'are born of God," or 'by the power of the promise itself,' as was Isaac from Sarah, when by nature she was now unfit for conceiving; and by "the children of God," I consider are meant those whom the apostle has before affirmed to be Israel in truth, 'those,' namely, 'to whom adoption, with the other privileges enumerated, have been given, not by outward ministration merely, but according to inward grace.'

9. "For this is the word of promise, at this (very) time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son." He next proves the consequence of the foregoing enthymeme, by adducing, from Gen. xviii. 10, the promise according to which Isaac was born a child of promise, reasoning thus:

'Isaac is a child of promise, as appears from the promise concerning his approaching birth,—"At this (very) time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son:"

'Therefore, if all who are the seed of Abraham are not also children, but the seed of Abraham is called in Isaac, it follows that the children of the flesh are not the children of God, but that the children of the promise are reckoned for the seed;'

To this, which is the general proposition, the apostle might have subjoined the assumption:

'But all who are of Israel, as their father, are not the children of the promise,' as is plain from the fact of their rejecting the promise and cleaving to the law or carnal commandment:

Whence he deduces his reply, as a conclusion similar to the third, viz.:—'that all who are of Israel, as their father, are not also the true Israel, and reckoned for the seed.'

Hence, from first to last, which is the third process in the argument from the example:—'All who are of Abraham according to the flesh are not reckoned for the seed, but in Isaac only his seed is called:

'Therefore neither are all who are of Israel, Israel in truth.'

The assumption of the second syllogism in this threefold process alone is wanting, being sufficiently obvious, as we have already observed, from the apostasy of Israel, and their rejection of the promise, of which the opponents themselves were aware.

10. "And not only (he), but also Rebecca, when she had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (experienced this)." This is the second example in which the apostle is more concise than in the former; for, omitting both of these preliminary processes, as

well that from species to genus, as that which proceeds from genus to species, he thus reasons, as from a parallel case:—

'Both the sons of Isaac and Rebecca were not accounted as the seed, but only Jacob, who was the younger:

'Therefore, in like manner, all who are descended from Jacob or Israel, according to the flesh, are not also Israel in truth.'

The antecedent is set forth in this 10th verse, amplified by comparisons both of majority and of dissimilarity. The comparison of majority is, 'that not only Abraham, but also Rebecca, experienced this, viz., that all who are seed are not also children.' The comparison of dissimilarity is, that Abraham from different wives begot different seed—Ishmael, the child of the flesh, from Hagar the bondmaid, and Isaac, the child of the promise, from Sarah the free woman, (Gal. iv.); but the same mother, Rebecca, by one and the same father, Isaac, and at the same conception, conceived twins, and brought forth different nations—the one, the children of the promise, and the other the children of the flesh, (Gen. xxv. 23.)

11. "For (the children) being not yet born, and having done nothing either good or bad, that the purpose of God, according to (his own) election, might abide firm, not from works, but from him that calleth,

12. "It was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger." The antecedent, which was set forth in the verse immediately preceding, is here established by a twofold testimony. The first testimony is that of God by Moses, cited from Gen. xxv. 23:—

"The elder shall serve the younger:"

'Therefore, all who are the seed of Isaac and Rebecca are not also children; but the one is a child, and the other a servant.'

The antecedent is given in the 12th verse, being preceded, in verse 11, by an amplification of itself, from the adjunct of the time of the divine testimony, which is defined by its subject and disparates, 'God bore this testimony concerning the seed of Isaac and

Rebecca, the children being not yet born, and having done nothing either good or bad.' This amplification is contained in the first part of verse 11. In the remainder of the verse a reason for the adjunct of the time is given, under the form of a contrast, from its end, which is, 'that the purpose of God, according to election, might abide firm, not from the works of the children themselves, —for, as yet, they had done none,—but from God that calls;' that is, 'that the grace shown to Jacob, and his adoption—(which, by a metonymy of the cause for the effect, is here called "the purpose of God according to election,") when Esau was rejected and Jacob obtained the blessing—having been foretold, might be seen to depend, not upon the works of Jacob, but upon the free and effectual calling of God, who, as he freely chose Jacob according to the benevolent affection (εὐδοκία) of his own will, whilst, as yet, he was doing nothing,—yea, was still unborn,—so, in like manner, freely called and blessed him, without either the merit or preparation of works, when now born and applying himself to action; so that the preparation of the Papists, and merit of both kinds, whether seen or foreseen, here falls to the ground.

13. "According as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." The second testimony is that of Malachi, expounding Moses, whereby the same antecedent, and the different condition of the seed of Rebecca, viz., Jacob and Esau, is proved.

14. "What shall we say, therefore? Is there injustice with God?" This is the second prolepsis and prevention of objection on the part of those who argue for the people of the law. Their objection, in the present instance, is suggested by the proof of the last example, in which it has been said, 'that God neither confers grace, nor rejects "from works," but that grace is from "the purpose of God," according to his own election and calling, and altogether independent of works; so that grace makes a distinction between Jacob and Esau, who are by nature equal, and equally undeserving,

being freely given to Jacob, but not likewise to Esau.' The objection, therefore, runs thus:—

'He who gives unequal things to those who are equal is unjust;

'But in your opinion,' the opponents might say, 'God gives unequal things to those who are equal; for he loves Jacob and hates Esau, both being equal, and equally undeserving:

'What, therefore, shall we say? Is there unrighteousness with God?' The conclusion alone is given in the text, in the commencement of verse 14. "Far from it." The apostle first of all replies to the conclusion, by expressing his abhorrence of its impious blasphemy, at the close of the same 14th verse.

15: "For he saith to Moses, I will shew mercy to whom I shall have shewn mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I shall have had compassion." He next replies to the proposition—viz., 'that speaking of God, he is unjust who gives unequal things to those who are equal, bestows grace upon one, and rejects another from grace, both being equally undeserving'—by denying it; and the reason for the negation is this, 'that God is most free to determine concerning all his creatures according to his own will, which, as it is most free, so it is most just, and, therefore, the rule of all justice.' This the apostle here proves by the testimony of Moses and the Old Testament Scriptures, and that twofold. The first is concerning grace conferred, in verses 15, 16; the second concerning rejection to judgment, verse 17; whence, in verse 18, he concludes, that God is free to show mercy or to pardon, according to his own will, and is in both most just. As regards the first, then, the testimony itself is adduced out of Exod. xxxiii. 19, from which the apostle proves, that the source of grace conferred is the will of God, which is most free, without respect to our works, and this he does as follows:—

'The Lord says to Moses—אחנן "I will shew grace from mercy to whom I shall have shewn grace," that is, 'to whom I shall have willed to shew grace,' "and I will have compassion on whom I shall have had compassion," that is, 'on whom I shall have willed

to have compassion:' 'Therefore to will is not of him that willeth, nor to run of him that runneth, but both to will and to run are from God that sheweth mercy.'

The antecedent is given in the 15th verse, which contains the testimony of God, wherein the two following properties of the benevolent affection (εὐδοκίᾳ) of the will of God are set before us: the first is—'to be merciful or mercifully affected towards the wretched;' the second is—'from mercy to confer grace upon the wretched as a remedy for their wretchedness, so that they may be delivered out of it.' By hysterosis, the order of these is reversed in the text: for חנן, which stands first, signifies—'to shew grace from mercy,' and, consequently, is the effect of mercy, as we learn from the expression, of such frequent recurrence in the Psalms—חנני יהוה, "Be gracious unto me, O Jehovah:" while רחם, which is put last, is the cause of the former, and means—'to have compassion,' or 'to be affected with the mercy of a mother towards her wretched children.' So the apostle here renders the words of Moses in the most correct manner, and by the use of the most appropriate terms: for ἐλεεῖν in the Greek idiom is—'to help or do good to any one from mercy,' whence ἐλεημοσύνη 'that which is given to the wretched to relieve their wretchedness;' while the other term οἰκτειρειν denotes—'maternal affection,' and most correctly conveys the force of the original.

16. "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy." This is the consequent of the enthymeme whereby it is concluded—that whatever mercy or grace is bestowed upon us is of God alone, and in no degree from ourselves.' All the grace given from mercy is here comprised by the apostle under two heads, viz. 'to will' and 'to run;' or as he speaks in Phil. ii. 13, "to will and to do." The conclusion is therefore expressed in terms of the cause and its effects: 'God' is the sole cause; 'mercy,' then 'grace conferred from mercy as a remedy for wretchedness,' are the two effects. The conclusion is also illustrated by a contrast:—'both the mercy, and the grace

thence bestowed upon us, are from God, and not from ourselves.' And the grace itself is explained by a distribution of the whole into its parts, which are—'to will' and to perform;' the whole, or if you prefer it, the genus being—'the grace of God who shews mercy, conferred on us wretched.'

17. "For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, I have raised thee up for this very purpose." This is the second testimony, whereby the apostle proves, from the example of Pharaoh, that the rejection of the ungodly is in like manner subject to the will and providence of God as its first cause, and that prior, as has been already said of Esau, to all the evil deeds of the reprobate. The chain of causes, therefore, is this:—God, according to his most free and just will, rejects; the wicked man, being rejected, acts wickedly; whence follows his most justly merited condemnation. "I have raised thee up," the Lord says concerning Pharaoh, or 'caused thee to stand;' that is, 'I have both preserved thee from the beginning on purpose for judgment, even from conception that thou mightest be born, and with the same purpose I have, with much long-suffering, endured thee still acting wickedly, after the many plagues which I sent: so that, by this one word, it is indicated that Pharaoh was both made and preserved by God, or according to the most free will of God, as a vessel of wrath. Lest there should appear to be any injustice in this raising up of Pharaoh, and his preservation even whilst acting wickedly, inasmuch as it is an effect of God and proceeded from the will of God, this deed of God is illustrated by its twofold end, each unexceptionably good. "That I may shew my power in thee." The first end is—'the display of the power of God both to Pharaoh himself, who was ignorant of it (Exod. v. 2), and to all men everywhere, in most justly punishing him.' "And that my name may be declared throughout the whole earth." The second end is—'the praising of God and glorifying of his name by all the inhabitants of the earth, in consequence of the display of his power in the case of Pharaoh.'

18. "Therefore to whom he will he sheweth mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." This is the common conclusion, deduced from both testimonies, in this way:—

God testifies to Moses—that he does not will to confer grace upon all Israel, along with Moses himself, Exod. xxxiii. 16, compared with 19; for verse 19 contains the answer to the request of Moses in verse 16), but on whom he shall have willed; and (in Exod. ix. 16) he testifies that Pharaoh has been raised up by him that he may shew his own power in his punishment:

'Therefore to whom he will God shews mercy, and whom he will he hardens.'

The apostle, therefore, here teaches us that the will of God in itself (Eph. i. 5), and that most free, is the most just cause and source of predestination, and indeed both of the election of the elect unto salvation, and of the rejection of the rejected to condemnation.

19. "Thou wilt say therefore unto me, Why is he still angry?" This is the third prolepsis, and anticipation of an objection whereby the adversary perseveres in charging God with injustice, but on a new ground, viz., because he is angry with, or condemns and punishes those who are hardened. The objection runs thus:—

'If God hardens whom he will, it is unjust that he should be angry with those who are hardened;

'But the former is true,' the adversaries object, 'and so you yourself conclude:

'Therefore the latter is true also.'

This objection of the adversaries is therefore suggested by the foregoing conclusion of the apostle, which they take for their assumption. "For who can resist his will?" The assumption being manifest, taken as it is out of the apostle's own mouth, the adversary proves the proposition of his objection by an argument drawn from the omnipotence of the will of God, thus:—'No man can resist the will of God.

'Therefore, if God hardens whom he will, he should not be angry with those who are hardened.'

20. "Nay but, O man! Who art thou that repliest against God?" The apostle now proceeds to answer the objection. In this answer he neither recals his former conclusion, viz., 'that God hardens whom he will,' nor denies the antecedent of the foregoing enthymeme, viz., 'that no man can resist the will of God;' and, consequently lays down as true these two propositions: first,—'that the hardening of the reprobate is according to the will of God;' and, secondly,—'that those whom God shall have willed to harden shall not be able to resist his will, nor to avoid hardening.' These two positions having been laid down, he replies to the hypothetical proposition [of the syllogism], or consequent of the foregoing enthymeme, not only by denying it as most false, but, besides, by checking his blasphemous opponent for thus replying against God. He therefore not only denies as most false, but condemns of blasphemy and replying against God, the proposition—'that if God hardens whom he will, he is unjustly angry with him who is hardened;' and proves both the falsehood and the blasphemy in succession; but, by hysterosis, first the blasphemy, and then the falsehood. "Shall the thing fashioned say to him that fashioned it, why hast thou made me thus?" The argument by which he proves the charge of blasphemy is taken from the like, or, if you please, from the greater:—

'Even in human affairs, if the things fashioned shall say to him that fashioned it—'why have you formed me in this manner?' it will manifestly be guilty of replying and blasphemously opposing itself to the will of him that fashioned it. 'But, O man! whoever you may be, you are fashioned by God, and are the work of his hands; he is your creator, and it is by him that you were formed: much more therefore do you reply against God, and by so replying are a blasphemer, when you unjustly find fault with that, whatever it may be, which clearly and manifestly appears to have been done according to the will of God.'

The apostle, therefore, would here teach us two things:—first, 'that the will of God is the rule of all justice;' and, secondly, 'that every creature ought to acquiesce in that will, so that the creature should acknowledge as just whatever seems to be according to the will of God, nor ask any further reason for it than that it has been done according to that will.'

21. "Hath not the potter power over the clay, out of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" Having now shewn the blasphemy of this 'replying,' he goes on to prove the falsehood also of the hypothetical proposition—'that if God hardens whom he will, he is unjustly angry with those who are hardened;' and the argument by which he proves it is taken from the less:—

'The potter, a mere man, has justly power over the clay, out of the same lump to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour, without any stain or charge of injustice.

'But we, the whole human race, are clay, and less than clay, in the hand of God our creator; since he created us out of nothing, whilst the clay is something before it is formed by the potter: 'Much more, therefore, has God our creator power over us men, out of the same human race, according to his own most free will, to make one a vessel of wrath by hardening him, and another a vessel of mercy by shewing him mercy: and both without being at all stained or charged with injustice.' The assumption is omitted by the apostle as obvious; the proposition is given in this 21st verse; the conclusion amplified from the greater, is subjoined in the two following verses, 22, 23:—

22. "If indeed God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make known his power, hath endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath framed for destruction." The amplification consists of two parts: the first, which is contained in this 22d verse, respects the wicked and those who are hardened; the second—those to whom God shews mercy. The first is to this effect:—

'God, in order to make known his power—as has been previously said in reference to Pharaoh—has endured, with much long suffering, the vessels of wrath, that is, of dishonour, although framed for destruction, and hardened according to the will of God; and has long deferred executing judgment upon them, even while acting wickedly:

'Therefore, although he hardens whom he will, yet not only is he not unjust in being angry with those who are hardened, but is even merciful and long-suffering towards the wicked themselves, in long bearing with their wickedness.'

The first amplification therefore is from the greater:—Not only is God most just in being angry with those who are hardened, whom nevertheless he hardens of his own will, but he is even merciful towards them;' which he proves from the effect of the mercy of God, viz.—'that he long endures them while acting wickedly:'

God is merciful towards those whom he endures, while acting wickedly, even in enduring them: for that forbearance is from his mercy:

'But he endures the wicked while acting wickedly with much long-suffering, and long,' says the apostle here, as our Lord also had said before, (Matt. v. 45.)

This effect of the mercy of God, namely,—'his forbearance towards the wicked, is amplified, first of all by the manner in which it is effected—he has endured "with much long-suffering." Secondly, it is amplified by its subject, which is designated by two appellations: for they are first called "vessels of wrath;" and are next said to be fitted or framed (*κατηρτισμένα*) for destruction," just as planks in a fabric are framed and mutually fitted to each other: the former appellation indicates that hatred which was testified concerning Esau, (Mal. i. 3,) and which is common to all the ungodly, since they are all vessels of wrath, and such as God hates, as we read concerning Esau in the passage referred to; the latter appellation indicates the predestination according to that hatred, whereby, as vessels of wrath, they are destined for destruction, to be effected by its own intermediate causes. The third par-

ticular by which this long-suffering of God is amplified, is its final end—God endures the wicked with much long-suffering "to make known his power:" for this end he raised up and long endured Pharaoh; and for the same end he endures all the vessels of wrath. The apostle, therefore, teaches us—not only that God would be most just, although he should be angry with the wicked, and inflict punishment upon them, while yet unborn, and before they had done any evil, as Esau is said to have been then hated; but besides, that he is now even long-suffering and merciful towards them, inasmuch as he permits them to be born, and long endures them while acting wickedly after they are born.

23. "And that he might make known the riches of his glory towards the vessels of mercy, which he prepared unto glory." This is the second part of the conclusion with its amplification, having respect, as has been noticed under the preceding verse, to the elect, who are here described by three circumstances. First, they are described by their adjunct—they are "vessels of mercy;" Secondly, by the effect of that mercy, which is—'their preparation before time (προετοίμασις). Moreover, by "mercy," I understand here—that 'love,' of which, in Mal. i. 2, God testifies that Jacob, although equally wretched with his brother Esau, was the object; and that is just—'the purpose[a] of God, or benevolent affection (εὐδοκία) of his will,' which belongs to all the children of God in common with Jacob: by προετοίμασις again, or 'their preparation from eternity,' I consider is meant—'their predestination according to that benevolent affection (εὐδοκία) of the will of God.' The proximate end of this preparation, which is the third circumstance by which the elect are here described, is—'their glory,' to be accomplished by its own intermediate causes; "which," says the apostle, viz., 'the vessels of mercy,' "he before prepared," for so the original word signifies, "unto glory." Such is the description here given of the elect; and to them this

[a] Πρόθεσις.

second amplification of the conclusion—taken from the final cause for which God shews mercy to his own, and for which he before prepared them to glory—has respect: this final cause is—'the making known (γνώρισις) of the riches of the glory of God from mercy;' which is the ultimate end to which the glory of the elect is referred, that glory, namely, whereto they were before prepared according to the purpose of God. From this, the apostle would have us to observe that God is indeed long-suffering and merciful to all, even to those who are vessels of wrath; but that towards the elect, and those to whom he shews mercy, he is not only merciful, but "rich in mercy:" whence, throughout the Scriptures, we find the godly praying that God would be merciful to them, "according to the multitude of his mercies."

24. "Whom he hath also called." Thus far we have had two arguments in support of the apostle's second reply to that objection, which is the first and leading objection in this second refutation, as was formerly observed in our remarks on the conclusion of ver. 5. We come now to the third argument for the same, to which the apostle makes a transition in the commencement of this verse by a prolepsis, wherein he anticipates an objection arising out of the preceding amplification in ver. 23; in which it has been said—that those towards whom God makes known the riches of his glory from mercy, are "vessels of mercy," that is—were beloved before they existed,' as Jacob was, 'and according to that love, prepared or predestinated to glory before time:' since both this love, and the predestination which is according to it, are hidden and laid up in God, they afford occasion for objecting in the following way:—

'If salvation belong only to those who, according to mercy, have been predestinated to glory and salvation, for the making known (γνώρισιν) of the riches of the glory of God, no one can be certain of his own salvation, and that he shall be a partaker of that glory, since both this mercy and predestination, as has been said, are hidden;

'But the latter is absurd, viz:—that every one should be uncertain of his own salvation:

'Therefore, the opponents conclude, 'the former must be false, viz:—that all who shall be partakers of salvation have been predestinated according to mercy.'

To this objection the apostle replies by denying the hypothetical proposition. The reason for the negation is as follows:—

'Since all whom God, according to mercy, has predestinated to glory, he also effectually calls in time (for this is the second part of our preparation for glory, which was begun before time, and necessarily follows that preparation, (see chap. viii. 30), and since this calling is matter of consciousness to the called; the children of God both can and ought therefrom to be certain, both of their predestination which went before, and of the glory to which they have been predestinated:—

'Therefore although salvation belongs to none, except those who have been predestinated according to mercy, yet the apostle would not have us commence the tracing of our future glory from our predestination which is hidden in God, but to inquire both into our salvation and our predestination as its source from our calling, which is matter of consciousness; just as the apostle Peter (1st Epis. i. 10,) bids us make our calling and election sure from the fruits of our calling and the exercises of a holy life, as coming more within our knowledge than the calling itself.'

"Namely us, not only from among the Jews, but also from among the Gentiles." The apostle illustrates the calling of the predestinated by its subject, amplified by a distribution, which is set forth by a comparison of majority, thus:—'we who believe on Christ are the called of God'—this is the subject of the divine will; 'not only from among the Jews, but also from among the Gentiles'—these, viz., the Jews and Gentiles are the parts of the subject set forth by a comparison of majority: and this, as we have already noticed, is the third reason for the second reply of the apostle to the leading objection in this refutation. The reason is to the following effect:—'The people of God are not, as you

suppose, those who are Israelites according to the flesh, but we who believe on Christ and are the called of God, whether from among the Jews or from among the Gentiles:

'Therefore,' the apostle might say to his opponents, 'although Israel according to the flesh reject the salvation which I announce, yet it does not follow that it is not the true way of salvation, seeing that the whole people of God, namely, all the called from among Jews and Gentiles, embrace it.'

25. "As he also saith in Hosea, I will call that my people which was not my people; and her beloved, who was not beloved.

26. "And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it had been said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God." He proves the antecedent part by part, but by hysterosis; for he proves that first which was last in the distribution, viz.—'the calling of the Gentiles, and that all, even from among the Gentiles who believe on Christ, are the called of God, or of the number of his people and true members of his Church. The argument by which it is established is drawn from testimony, and that twofold, both taken from the prophet Hosea, the one from chap. iii. 23—"I will call that my people which was not my people; and her beloved, who was not beloved:" the other from chap. i. 10:—"And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it had been said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God." As it is allowed by the common consent of all that both these testimonies are to be accomplished in the reign of Christ, and in the gathering again of the Church under him, so, according to the interpretation of the apostle, here they are each to be taken not only of the gathering again of the Israelites who were rejected in the carrying away by Shalmaneser, but also of the Gentiles who were rejected at the building of Babel, remnants, through faith, from among both of whom are, according to the prediction of the prophet, to be gathered again under the reign of Christ.

27. "Moreover Isaiah crieth concerning Israel, although the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, a remnant shall be saved.

28. "For he will finish and speed the matter with righteousness, since the Lord will speedily accomplish the matter upon the land.

29. "And, as Isaiah has before said, unless the Lord of Hosts had left us a seed we should have become as Sodom, and should have been made like unto Gomorrha." He next proves the second part of the antecedent, namely,—'the rejection of the multitude of the Jews;' that is—'that not all who are of Israel, or the body and multitude of the Jews and Israelitish people, are the called of God, members of his Church and his people; but only the few, and the remnant of that people who were believers, and embraced the faith that is in Christ.' The argument by which this is proved is, in like manner, drawn from a double testimony, both taken from Isaiah; the one from chap. x. 22, 23; the other from chap. i. 9. According to the interpretation of the apostle here, each of these testimonies is to be understood not only of the rejection of the ten tribes in the days of Hezekiah, but also of the multitude of the Jews at the coming of the Messiah. It is clear also from both, that not the body and multitude of that people, but a remnant only, are the called and people of God; and that unless God had left this remnant from his own mercy, and according to election, as the apostle speaks both here and elsewhere, it would have been all over with the whole of that nation, and 'Israel,' says the prophet, 'would have become as Sodom and Gomorrha.'

30. "What shall we say therefore? That the Gentiles who were not following after righteousness have attained to righteousness, and that righteousness which is from faith." He now concludes the antecedent of the foregoing enthymeme, viz.—'that the called

of God are those who believe, not only from among the Jews, but also from among the Gentiles; and the conclusion, like the proof, consists of two parts. In the first he makes reference to the first part of the proof, and from the testimonies cited out of Hosea, infers—'Therefore, the Gentiles have apprehended righteousness.' This conclusion the apostle presses by anacoenosis—'what shall we say?' He also amplifies it by two considerations. The first is from the disparate of the Gentiles obtaining righteousness:—'the Gentiles who were not following after righteousness have obtained it.' The second consideration by which it is amplified is a definition of the righteousness which the Gentiles have obtained; which the apostle here defines by its genus, it is 'righteousness;' and by its instrumental cause, or, if you please—since here, as throughout the writings of this apostle faith, by metonymy of the adjunct for the subject, may be taken for 'Christ apprehended by faith'—by its instrumental cause and subject at the same time: the righteousness, therefore, which the Gentiles have apprehended is—'the righteousness of Jesus Christ whom they have apprehended by faith.'

31. "But that Israel, who were following after the law of righteousness, have not reached the law of righteousness." This is the second part of the conclusion concerning the rejection of the multitude of the Jews and Israelitish people—"Israel," that is 'the body or multitude of that people,' "have not reached the law of righteousness;" and it is amplified by a contrast—'although they were following after the law of righteousness, yet have they not reached the law of righteousness.' By "the law of righteousness" here I understand—'the fulfilment of the law,' or 'that righteousness which the law demands;' for he that fulfils the law is said to "reach the law."

32. "Wherefore? because not from faith, but as if from the works of the law." The reason of the latter part of the conclusion, and why Israel did not reach the law of righteousness, is taken

from the disparate of Israel,—"(Israel was) not (following after righteousness) from faith;" this is amplified by a contrast,—"but from the works of the law;" and the apostle adds,—"as if (ὡς) from the works of the law," because, to those who had performed them with a view to justification, they were not really the works of the law, but only the fruits of their own hypocrisy, as our Lord testifies in Mat. xxiii., when he accuses the Scribes and Pharisees, who gloried in such works, of hypocrisy. For no works are works of law, unless they are altogether conformable to the law; and such, according to the testimony of the prophet in Ps. cxliii., can be found in no flesh, Christ excepted. As the Jews, however, had sought after righteousness by these fruits of their own hypocrisy, as if by the works of the law, and not from faith, they did not reach the law of righteousness, or that righteousness which is approved by the law. The apostle, therefore, would here teach us three things: 1st, That there are no works of preparation, as the Papists speak; for the Gentiles apprehended righteousness while they were not seeking after it; 2d, That the merit of our own works avails nothing for righteousness; for while Israel were seeking after righteousness from works, they did not attain to it; 3d, That those who have apprehended Christ by faith, have in Christ that righteousness which the law demands; for Israel did not reach the law of righteousness, because they were not following after righteousness from faith, as the Gentiles who believed, nor after that righteousness which is approved by the law, as the apostle has above said. "For they stumbled at the stone of stumbling." We have here the reason of the unbelief of the Israelites from their effect,—'they stumbled against Christ.' The apostle, therefore, reasons thus:—'Whosoever stumbles against Christ cannot be seeking after righteousness from faith,'—for 'to believe on Christ,' and 'to stumble against him,' are opposites; 'But the Israelites have stumbled:

'Therefore,' &c.

33. "As it is written, Behold I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling

and a rock of offence." As, in the preceding verse, he called Jesus Christ, against whom the Israelites stumbled, a "stone of stumbling;" so, in this verse, which is the last of the chapter, he proves, by the testimony of the ancient Scriptures, that it was predicted both that Christ would be a stone of stumbling, and that the Israelites would stumble against him:—"Behold, I lay in Zion," says the Lord concerning Christ, "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence:" 'see! it is predicted that Christ is to be a stone of stumbling, and that both to the Israelites and the Jews, both because the prophet is speaking of them in Is. viii. 14, and because in Is. xxviii. 16, it is said, that this stone of stumbling is to be laid in Zion, which is the visible Church.' Moreover, Jesus Christ is called "a stone of stumbling," not because he occasions offence or stumbling to any one; for, although he is often rejected even by the builders, (Ps. cxviii. 22; Matt. xxv. 42,) yet is he that "precious and elect" stone, "which is become the head of the corner," (Acts iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7): but he is called "a stone of stumbling," because many are stumbled by his cross, and take offence at him which is not given by him. In order to teach us this here, the apostle subjoins—"Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame; by which words, cited out of the prophet, the apostle would have us learn four thing:—1st, That upon this stone which the builders reject, and at which both houses of Israel stumble, all who are truly inhabitants of Sion, and genuine members of the Church of God, must nevertheless believe; 2d, That those who believe on him shall not be disappointed nor put to shame by their hope, but shall certainly attain that salvation which they wait for from him; 3d, That that salvation, although certain, must yet be waited for patiently in holiness; and that 'believers,' as the prophet speaks, 'must not make haste,' nor grasp at any means of deliverance accompanied with transgression, or illegitimate; whence, in the 4th place, it follows, that it is this stone of which it is said that it is truly "precious," and "elected" by God; and which, consequently, is that 'rock,

against those built on which through faith the gates of hell shall never prevail.'

CHAPTER X.

"Brethren, the ardent desire of my heart, and (my) deprecation to God concerning Israel is, for (their) salvation." Thus far, in the preceding chapter, we have had three arguments for the apostle's second reply to the first and leading objection; we now come to the fourth and last argument for the same, which is as follows:—

'All Israel are to be gathered again, and will at length receive and embrace that righteousness and salvation through Jesus Christ, which they now reject:

'Therefore, although they now reject the way of salvation through faith on Jesus Christ, which I announce, yet it does not follow from this, that it is not the true way.' (See our previous remarks on the latter part of the 5th verse of chap. ix.)

This argument is taken from the adjunct of the future gathering again of the Israelites, or, if you choose, their act in at length receiving the faith. The antecedent of the enthymeme follows, long after, in the 26th verse of chap. xi.,—"All Israel shall be saved;" on the proof of which antecedent, as about to be a great mystery in the Christian Church, just as the calling of the Gentiles had been in the Jewish, the apostle dwells from the beginning of chap. x. to the 33d verse of chap. xi. In this proof he makes use of six arguments. The first of these is taken from the adjunct of the apostle's deprecation, whereby he deprecates the judgment of the present apostacy* of Israel, and prays in their behalf that they may be gathered again for salvation in Christ. The argument runs thus:—

* Ἀποστασίας.

'The judgments of those, to deprecate whose judgments, and pray for whose salvation, God gives an ardent desire to his saints, are to be removed, and they themselves to become partakers of the salvation of God;

'But God gives to me,' says the apostle, 'an ardent desire to pray and deprecate in behalf of Israel:

'Therefore, the present judgment and apostacy of Israel is to be removed, and they themselves are at length to become partakers of the salvation of God.'

The assumption is given in the 1st verse of this chapter,—"the ardent desire of my heart, and my deprecation to God concerning Israel is for their salvation," but the proposition is omitted as obvious, and as resting for its foundation in the 26th and 27th verses of chap. viii.—"in like manner the Holy Spirit also helpeth our weaknesses, &c. Hence, it appears that the gift of praying is from God, just as the grace we ask in our prayers; and consequently, that the grace sought is the reward of the gift of praying, which is the surest proof that the grace itself will be given by the Lord in his own time, as our Lord himself plainly teaches us in Matt. vii. 7, and following verses, as far as verse 12.

2. "For I bear witness concerning them that they have a zeal of God." The reason for the assumption, and why Paul prays for Israel is here assigned: it is taken from their adjunct, which is—"zeal of God;" and this is established by the testimony of the apostle—"I bear witness concerning them that they have a zeal of God." "Zeal," moreover, is a human affection compounded of love and anger; because when we love what is good, and from our love for the good which is beloved by us are angry, and from the greatness of that love inflamed with anger at that, as an evil, which threatens to injure or deprive us of the good we love, this anger against what is evil from love of what is good, or love of what is good kindled by hatred of what is evil, is called 'zeal.' That zeal, then, whereby we are so affected with love towards and desire after the worship and glory of God, that, from our love for

God and his worship, we are angry at, and hate as an enemy whatever seems to obstruct that worship and glory, or threatens to deprive us of God or of his worship, is called—"a zeal of God." The apostle, therefore, here bears witness concerning the Israelites, that they loved God and his glory so intensely as to be transported with vehement hatred against any thing which threatened to deprive them of God, or to prove injurious to his worship. "But not according to knowledge." He illustrates the zeal of the people of Israel by a contrast—"they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." This is not to be understood as if the Israelites had no understanding, or were absolutely ignorant of that with the zeal of which they were affected, as the Papists in the present day build their devotion on ignorance and implicit faith; for the Israelites were acquainted with the traditions which they had received from the fathers, and were affected with zeal in their conversation, according to these traditions (Matt. xv. 3; Gal. i. 14): but inasmuch as that conversation was "vain," as the apostle Peter terms it, (1st Epis. i. 18,) the apostle here calls their knowledge of these traditions, according to which they lived, 'ignorance;' the true knowledge of the worship of God being founded on the sacred word of God alone. The knowledge, therefore, which the apostle here denies to Israel, is a knowledge of the word of God and of his will, as revealed in his written word. For although they possessed that word, (seeing that "to them were committed the oracles of God,") and God's revealed will concerning his own worship and the righteousness of man, yet neither the people, nor their teachers themselves, understood either the word of God, or his will as therein revealed; whence Christ in the Gospel frequently both calls and convicts them of being—"blind guides," who neither, on account of their ignorance, entered themselves, nor suffered others to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Thus while Nicodemus, a teacher in Israel, is being instructed by Christ, he shews that he is ignorant even of the new birth, (παλιγγενεσίας,) which is the entrance into the kingdom of heaven; and the rest of the Pharisees, although they knew from the word

that Christ was to be both the son and Lord of David, were yet ignorant how he could be both his son and his Lord (Matt. xxii:) so, in this place, the apostle imputes the zeal of the Israelites in establishing their own righteousness, which is from the works of the law, to ignorance of the righteousness of God. The apostle, therefore, here ascribes to the Israelites a zeal of God, but built upon the ignorance of what is commonly called a "crooked" disposition, that is, not upon God's word, of which, as has been said, they were ignorant, but upon the traditions of the fathers replete with errors, which, however, they both knew and followed with zeal. This was Paul's own condition before he was called by Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 14; Phil. iii. 6;) and this, Paul testifies in the passage before us, was the condition of the rest of the Israelites who still spoke against Christ. Such a condition of men, the apostle here teaches us by his example, is rather an object of pity than of hatred; and therefore he testifies, that he was moved by the Spirit of God, from a holy compassion for this condition, to utter prayers to God in behalf of those who were affected with such a zeal of God, that, being ignorant of God's truth, they might be delivered from the judgment of their apostacy.

3. "For being ignorant of God's righteousness, and desiring to establish their own righteousness, they have not been subject to God's righteousness." He proceeds to prove the latter part of the contrast, or 'that the zeal of God which the Israelites had was not according to knowledge.' The arguments by which he proves it are three: the first in this verse; the second in verse 5; and the third in verse 13. The first argument is drawn from the subject or object of that zeal which is according to knowledge; it is —'a zeal of God's righteousness;' of which 'the zeal of the Israelites,' who have a zeal of God, is the disparate. The apostle, therefore, thus reasons:—

'That zeal of God which is according to knowledge is subject to God's righteousness;

But the Israelites, having a zeal of God, are not subject to God's righteousness:

'Wherefore the zeal of God which the Israelites have is not that which is according to knowledge.'

The proposition of the syllogism is omitted as obvious. The assumption is given at the close of verse 3d, illustrated by its causes, of which two are adduced in the preceding words of the verse: the first is—'ignorance of God's righteousness;' the second —'desire of their own righteousness:' for it is because they are ignorant of God's righteousness, and desirous of their own righteousness, that the Israelites, having a zeal of God, are yet not subject to God's righteousness. Moreover I understand "God's righteousness" here to be the same as that which has been above defined, c. iii. 22; and 'the subjection' with which we are subject to this righteousness of God, I expound from the words of the apostle in 2d Cor. x. 4, to be—'that whereby all reasoning and all loftiness within us which exalts itself against the knowledge of God is cast down, so that every thought within us is brought into captivity to the obedience of Jesus Christ:' whence, on the contrary, 'not to be subject to God's righteousness' is—'by one's own reasoning to exalt one's self against the knowledge of God, and through trust in one's own righteousness to rebel against Christ and God's righteousness in him.' With this disobedience the apostle here charges the Israelites, and traces it, first of all, to ignorance of God's righteousness, and then to desire and zeal of their own righteousness, as its causes; not speaking of their own righteousness because they either had or could have any righteousness of their own, but calling that their own, after which, although to no purpose, they strove in their own strength. From this the apostle would teach us two things: first, that no one can be subject to God's righteousness who is ignorant of God's righteousness; so that, contrary to what the Papists teach, knowledge is necessary for faith and rendering obedience to Christ: secondly, that all who subject themselves to Christ must renounce their own righteousness; so that human merit, or the desire of our own

righteousness, and Christ, or God's righteousness in him, are things inconsistent and such as cannot subsist together.

4. "For Christ is the end of the law." He now proves the last assumption, viz.—that the Israelites do not subject themselves to God's righteousness; the argument being drawn from the primary and principal subject of God's righteousness, which is Jesus Christ:

'Whoever is subject to God's righteousness is also subject to Christ Jesus;'

'But the Israelites have not subjected themselves to Christ:

'Therefore neither are they subject to God's righteousness.'

The assumption is obvious even to the opponents themselves: but the apostle proves the proposition, namely—'that whoever is subject to God's righteousness is also in Christ, or subject to Christ;' and the argument of proof is taken from a description of Christ in this way:—

'Christ is the end of the law,' or, which is the same thing, 'that righteousness of God which is approved by the law:

'Therefore whoever is subject to God's righteousness is also in Christ and subject to him.'

The antecedent is given in the commencement of this 4th verse; and the consequent is obvious: for since Christ is the end of the law in two ways—first because the law as 'our child-leader (Gal. iii. 24), leads us to Christ, that we may be justified through faith on him;' and secondly, because Christ has fulfilled the law in our name, and has become 'our righteousness,' (1 Cor. i. 30)—it follows that whosoever, being subject to God's righteousness, and having renounced the merit of his own works, subjects all his own reasonings and thoughts to him, is also in Christ and subject to him. "For righteousness to every one that believeth." He next explains the foregoing description of Christ, wherein he is said to be "the end of the law" by its end; and the end again by its subject, Christ is—"the end of the law for righteousness," *i. e.*, 'that he may impart to us the righteousness which he has pro-

cured by his own keeping of the law, so that we ourselves, being clothed therewith, may be righteous in the sight of God;' this is the end: and then this righteousness is said 'to belong to all who believe, whether Jews or Gentiles;' which is the subject of that righteousness, as before observed on the 22d verse of chapter iii.

5. "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is from the law, that he who shall have done these things shall live by them." This is the second argument by which the apostle proves the latter member of the contrast, viz., 'that the zeal of the Israelites is not according knowledge.' The argument runs thus:—

'Moses testifies that righteousness from the law is impossible and unattainable by man; but that the righteousness of faith is easy and near at hand:

'Therefore the zeal of the Israelites, which is a zeal of the law, but not of the righteousness of faith, is not according to knowledge, but according to ignorance even of Moses himself in whom they glory.'

The antecedent of this enthymeme is proved, part by part, from a description of both kinds of righteousness; which description is taken out of Moses, Lev. xviii. 5; Deut. xxx. 12. First of all, the apostle shews the difficulty and indeed impossibility of the righteousness of the law, from a description of the righteousness of the law in this 5th verse, which is to the following effect:—'Whosoever has kept these things, namely, the precepts of God, or of his law, shall live by them;' by which description it is shewn that there is no righteousness or life from the law, except to those who keep the law, and that perfectly, so as to continue in all things that are written in the book of the law, (Deut. xxvii. 26.) Hence the apostle thus reasons:—

'There is no righteousness or life from the law, except to those who keep the law in all respects and perfectly'—for this description of the righteousness of the law is from Moses; to which the apostle subjoins the assumption—

'But no man has kept those things which are written in the

book of the law'—which even the Jews themselves knew, since they offered sacrifices for sins on that account, (Gal. ii. 15, 16): whence the conclusion—

'Therefore righteousness from the law is impossible and a thing which cannot be attained.'

6. "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh thus;" Say not in thine heart, who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring down Christ from (on high;)

7. "Or, who shall descend into the abyss? that is, to bring back Christ from the dead."

He next proves the second part of the antecedent, or 'the ease of the righteousness of faith;' the argument by which it is proved being in like manner taken from the Mosaic description of that righteousness. That description consists of a contrast; the first member or arsis of which is contained in these 6th and 7th verses, and the second in the commencement of verse 8, and what follows thereafter. In the two verses before us, then, the apostle, by adducing the testimony of Moses, releases every one who seeks righteousness from faith out of a twofold difficulty: he releases him out of the one when he says—'let him not think of ascending into heaven,' verse 6: the release out of the other is thus expressed—'there is no need that he should think of descending into the abyss,' verse 7. Each of these is illustrated by its end: the former, or the ascent into heaven, by this end—'to bring down Christ;' the latter, or the descent into the abyss, by this—'to bring back Jesus Christ from the dead,' (for as the apostle comments upon and explains Moses): because, forsooth, if it were necessary that one should ascend into heaven in order that he might be justified by faith, it would be for this end, viz., that he might thence bring down Jesus Christ, again to assume our flesh, and in that flesh to die: or if he had to descend into the abyss, he would do so, that he might bring Christ back from the dead. From all this toil, both of ascending and descending, and at the

same time from the end of each, the apostle shews, out of Moses, that all who seek righteousness from faith are relieved; since God, without any exertion on our part, without our either ascending or descending, has done both things for us; both sent Christ from heaven in his own time, (Gal. iv. 4), and after Christ had died for our sins, brought him back and raised him again from the dead, that we might be justified through faith on him. To render this plain, I observe, that by 'the bringing down of Christ out of heaven' here, I understand—'the mission of the Son to assume our flesh, and his death in the flesh for the remission of our sins,' (chap. iv. last verse): again, by 'the bringing back of Christ from the dead,' I understand—'his resurrection, and all his subsequent glory, for our justification,' as it is said in the passage just quoted. Moreover both of these, both the descent of Christ, and his rising again from the dead, are necessary to the righteousness of faith; just as the perfect keeping of the law is necessary to the righteousness of the law: but the apostle shews out of Moses that they differ in this—that he who seeks righteousness from faith is relieved from these difficulties, so that he has neither to bring Christ down from heaven, nor to bring him back from the dead; whilst, on the other hand, the whole difficulty of righteousness from the law falls upon him who seeks that righteousness, so that he must either of his own strength keep the law without fail, or he can have no righteousness from the law. That difficulty therefore which remains to those who seek righteousness from the law is removed from those who seek righteousness from faith; for God, wholly of his own mercy, and without any exertion on their part, has removed out of their way all the difficulty of that righteousness, since he himself, without any exertion of theirs, both sent Christ from heaven and brought him back from the dead.

8. "But what saith it? The word is near thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart." This is the second member of the contrast and thesis, or affirmative description of the righteousness of faith, which is this—'that whosoever has the word in his mouth and in

ms heart, is righteous, and being justified by faith shall live.' This description is presented by the apostle in the form of a dialogue; for he first of all asks what Moses says concerning the righteousness of faith, *i.e.*, in what manner and in what words he describes that righteousness; then, as it were with the consent of his opponents, he subjoins the reply—that Moses says concerning the righteousness of faith, to you who seek righteousness by faith that "the word is near thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart," as much as to say—'if you have the word in your mouth and in your heart, you are righteous by faith, and shall live, shall live by faith.' The apostle, therefore, thus proves the latter part of the antecedent:—

'If Jesus Christ, being sent from heaven by the Father, both died for us and rose again from the dead, freely and without exertion on our part, so that every one who has the word in his heart and in his mouth, being justified through him, shall be saved, it follows, that the righteousness of faith is not like the righteousness of the law, impossible, but freely obtained by, and near at hand to those that seek it'—this, which is the proposition, is omitted as obvious:

'But the former is true'—this, which is the assumption, is given in these three verses, (6th, 7th, 8th:)

Whence follows the conclusion—'that the latter is true, and that the righteousness of faith is near at hand to, and freely obtained by all who believe, and who seek righteousness and life from faith.'

In this way we may collect the argument of the passage; or, if you prefer it, the arsis or first member of the contrast being omitted, more concisely, thus:—

'If every one is justified by faith who has the word in his mouth and in his heart, righteousness is near at hand and easy through grace; 'But the former is true: 'Therefore the latter is true.' "That is, the word of faith which we preach." He next explains the latter member of the contrast, or the affirmative description of the righteousness of faith; which description consists of two parts: for, first of all, in the remainder of the verse he shews what is this "word" of which Moses speaks; and then in verse 9, what it is to have this word in our mouth and in our heart. As regards the

former, the "word" is described by its subject and instrumental cause: its subject is—'faith on Christ apprehended by faith,' (unless you prefer to take "faith" in its proper acceptation, and to consider the description as drawn from the effect of the word:) its instrumental causes are—'the apostles of Christ by whom it is preached:' 'this word,' says the apostle, 'of which Moses speaks, is the word of faith which we, the apostles, preach.' The apostle thus anticipates an objection which the adversaries might be ready to bring forward, viz.—'that in the passage quoted from Deut. (c. xxx. 12, 13,) Moses is speaking of the word of the law, but not of the gospel, or word of faith;' to whom the apostle replies by asserting the negative opposite—that it is the gospel and word of faith, and not the word of the law of which Moses is speaking. And so, before the apostle, the prophet Jeremiah has interpreted Moses in c. xxxi. 31, &c., where he shews that this word to be written on the heart, of which Moses speaks, is the word of the new covenant or gospel to be revealed in the last days, but not of the law or covenant of work which the Israelites broke, and which word was formerly "written on stones," but not "on the fleshly tables of the heart."

9. "(Namely) that if thou shall confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." This is the other part of the explanation, of which again there are two members; and these are set forth by hysterosis; for 'to have the word in the mouth,' which is last in order, is first explained. First of all, therefore, 'to have the word of the gospel in the mouth,' the apostle says is—'to confess with the mouth that Jesus Christ is Lord;' then 'to have this word in the heart' is—'to believe that God has raised him from the dead,' or, that having died for our sins he has been raised up for our justification:' for so I take it the whole work of redemption is to be understood by synecdoche, under the head of the resurrection of Christ; and he purposely makes mention of the resurrection, because, in the days of the apostles, nothing re-

lating to Jesus Christ was so much talked of as his resurrection from the dead. 'To have the word of faith in the heart,' therefore, is—to believe in Christ, and 'to have it in the mouth' is—to profess our faith. The apostle illustrates both the faith and the profession by their subject *to which*,* or object; and by their end or effect. The subject of the faith is—'the raising again of Jesus Christ from the dead;' that is—'Jesus Christ himself, and the work of our redemption in him, who died and rose again:' the subject of the profession—'Jesus Christ's lordship over us;' which is both different from that which he has over other creatures, on account of the work of our redemption accomplished by his death, and glorious for ever. In fine, the common effect both of the faith and the profession is—'salvation;' "thou shalt be saved," says the apostle; and this salvation also presupposes righteousness.

10. "For with the heart it is believed unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." We have here the reason of the explanation, taken from the proper subject *in which*,† and the end or effect, first of faith and then of confession, or profession, thus:—We believe with the heart, or faith is in the heart; wherefore to have Christ in the heart, is to believe on Christ raised from the dead: in like manner confession is of the mouth, or it is the mouth wherewith we confess Christ, and which is the subject *in which* of confession; wherefore to have Christ in the mouth is to confess that Christ Jesus is Lord. The apostle illustrates both faith in the heart and confession with the mouth by their end or effect; for we believe with the heart—"unto righteousness," *i.e.* our righteousness or justification is the end and effect of faith in our heart; just as—"salvation" is the end of our confession. Moreover the apostle calls salvation the end and effect of confession, not because it is not also the effect of faith, but that he may teach us that all who believe on Christ must also profess him in order to their becoming partakers of his salvation; so that

* *Ad quod.* † *In quo.*

it is not enough for a man to say that he believes on Christ, if, in the mean time, he refuses to confess him, especially when he is asked to give an account of his faith: and God calls us to confession even at the risk of death, and with the loss of everything which we possess in life; 'for he,' says our Lord, Matt. xvi. 25, 'who wishes to save his life [by changing sides and refusing to profess Christ,] is unworthy of me, and shall lose his life.' For this reason, therefore, the apostle urges profession along with faith in the case of all who are to be saved; as likewise Peter, 1st Epist. iii. 15; since this profession is the "seal" wherewith we are sealed to the Lord in the sight of the world, and 'the name of God written on our forehead,' to be read by all even in the midst of persecutions.

11. "For the Scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame." By adducing the testimony of Scripture (Is. xxviii. 16), he proves the reason which he has just concluded, namely—'that confession of the mouth must be combined with faith in the heart, and that confession with the mouth is unto salvation,' or 'that the salvation of all those who from faith confess that Jesus is Lord, is certain.' For two things are signified by the expression—"shall not be put to shame:" (1.) the duty of him who believes; (2.) the grace of him who perseveres in that duty. The duty of him who believes is—'to profess his hope without shame, and that Jesus Christ, as he is revealed in the Gospel, is the Lord of his hope;' "I am not ashamed," says the apostle, c. i. 16, "of the gospel of Christ:" and the grace of him who perseveres in that duty is—'that he shall not be put to shame or disappointed by his hope; for "hope putteth not to shame," c. v. 5. Consequently he is said "not to be put to shame,' who is neither ashamed of the Lord Jesus, nor visited with shame on account of the hope which he has reposed in him; the apostle therefore thus argues from the prophet:—

'Whoever believes on Jesus Christ shall not be put to shame,' *i. e.* 'he will neither be ashamed to profess the Lord, nor shall his hope put him to shame when he so professes:'

'Therefore confession of the mouth both follows faith, and the salvation of all who profess from faith is certain.'

12. "For there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile." The apostle, in quoting from the ancient Scriptures, having expounded and taught that what is asserted by the prophet indefinitely—"he that believeth," Is. xxviii. 16—is to be taken universally, and that the meaning is—'Whosoever believeth,' proceeds to establish his exposition, and to prove that the prophet is to be understood universally. The argument employed is from the removal of the distinction, or, as he elsewhere speaks, from 'the breaking down of the middle wall of partition,' by which Jews and Gentiles were distinguished under the law, and which, under the reign of Christ, no longer exists; whence the apostle thus reasons: 'Under the reign of Christ, there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile, but they are both alike in Christ Jesus'—this, which is the antecedent, is given in the text: whence the conclusion.

'Therefore what was formerly said concerning the grace of those who believe, is now common to any who believe'—"*Whosoever* believeth on him shall not be put to shame."

"For the same Lord of all." He next proves the foregoing antecedent—'that there is no distinction between Jew and Greek;' and the arguments by which he proves it are two. The first is taken from their common Lord; for he who, according to mutual covenant, was the God and Lord of the Israelites, under the law, is now, under the reign of Christ, the same Lord of all, since "now," under the reign of Christ, as it is said, in Rev. xii. 10, "is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God." "Is rich towards all." The second argument is from the abundance of the grace of God, which now, under the reign of Christ, is poured out upon all in common, both Jews and Gentiles:—

'God is rich in mercy towards all, both Jews and Greek:

'Therefore, whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame.'

"By whom he is invoked." This is an epanorthosis of the foregoing antecedent, whereby the apostle shews that these riches of the mercy of God extend to all, indeed, yet not to individuals of classes, but to classes of individuals,—that is, to the elect from amongst all, both Jews and Gentiles,—who are here described by their effect, viz.—'their invocation of the name of God:'—

'God is rich in mercy towards all; but, by "all," I mean only the elect from among all, and whosoever invoke him, whether from among the Jews or from among the Gentiles.'

13. "For whosoever shall invoke the name of the Lord shall be saved." This is the establishment of the foregoing antecedent, from the testimony of Joel, chap. ii. 32, from which let it be observed, that 'the invocation of the name of God' is a part, and, as it were, a species of that confession from faith whereby the word of God is in the mouth unto salvation; so that the duty, previous to salvation, of those who believe on Jesus Christ is—'to confess the Lord, and to confess to the Lord.' We 'confess the Lord' when we give an account of our faith before men, and profess that Jesus is Lord, according to the truth which is in him; we 'confess to the Lord' by every kind of invocation and celebration of the name of God, and in this twofold confession of those who believe, whereby they confess the Lord, and confess to the Lord, that zeal of God which is according to knowledge is displayed.

14. "How then shall they invoke him on whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

15. "And how shall they preach unless they have been sent?" This is the third argument whereby the apostle proves 'that the zeal of the Israelites is not according to knowledge,' to which he has made a transition by the foregoing epanorthosis, and testimony of the prophet concerning the certain salvation of all that invoke

the name of God. This third argument is taken, partly from the adjunct of the sending or inward calling of the apostles, partly from the conduct of the Israelites in rejecting the apostles with their preaching. The apostle therefore reasons thus:—

'Although those who reject the apostles and men sent by God to preach the gospel, invoke God, and have a zeal, yet is that zeal not according to knowledge;

'But we have been sent by God, and the Israelites reject us sent by God:

'Therefore, although the Israelites have a zeal of God, yet that zeal of theirs is not according to knowledge.'

The proposition of this syllogism, which is omitted, the apostle proves from the adjunct of the necessity of the sending or inward calling of those who preach, which he demonstrates in verse 14, and the beginning of verse 15, by a resolution of effects into their necessary causes, and that of five stages. The first effect is—'invocation,' which, from the foregoing testimony, the apostle has proved to be of necessity previous to salvation; hence, therefore, he thus reasons by a sorites, or prosyllogism of successive stages:—

'There is no invocation without faith; there is no faith without hearing; there is no hearing without a preacher; there is no preacher without sending:

'Therefore, from first to last, there is no invocation unto salvation, unless those who are to preach the word of God have been sent, and, consequently, the invocation of all who reject the apostles and those whom God sends to preach the word of faith, is no invocation, and although they have a zeal, they have not that zeal which is according to knowledge.'

From this chain of effects and causes, the apostle would teach us three things:—1st, That the invocation and zeal of unbelievers, although they present the appearance of remarkable devotion, are yet all nothing more than an empty shew, but no genuine invocation or zeal, because invocation unto salvation belongs only to those who believe; 2dly, That there is ordinarily no faith apart from the word, (for it is the ordinary administration of God which

is here treated of; nor does the apostle bind or confine God's extraordinary operation to ordinary means, such as the sending of preachers, and the hearing of the word preached,) so that that faith which is built upon tradition apart from the word, and the faith of those who despise preaching is no faith at all; 3dly, That he who, as the apostle speaks, "desireth the office of a bishop," or applies himself to the preaching of the word of faith, must attend first of all to the sending of God, and inward calling, since no man will preach as he ought, unless he has been sent by God, and inwardly called. "As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of those that preach the gospel of peace, that preach the gospel of good things!" Next comes the assumption, in the rest of the 15th, and whole of the 16th verses, consisting of two parts; the first is—'We, the apostles, have been sent by God to preach the word of faith;' the second—'the Israelites do not believe, but reject us who have been sent to preach the gospel.' The first part is itself omitted, but is here proved from the testimony of the prophet concerning the apostles who were to be sent to preach the gospel, and their reception by the elect only. Although rejected by the world of those that perish, yet, to the elect, the prophet in these words predicts that the expected heralds of the gospel would come from God, so that, to them, their feet should be beautiful.

16. "But they have not all obeyed the gospel; for Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?" We have, in these words, the second part of the assumption—'but the Israelites do not believe us who have been sent from God to preach the gospel:' this is both itself expressed in the text, and the proof of it added from the testimony of the prophet, Isa. liii. 1, where, being about to foretell the sufferings of the Son of God, and the glory that should follow, the prophet not only complains of the unbelief of his own age, but also presents to view the future difference among the Israelites under the reign of Christ, and the full revelation of the gospel.

17. "Therefore faith is from hearing, and hearing through the word of God." The conclusion of the third argument—'Therefore the invocation of the Israelites is no invocation, and although they have a zeal, yet it is not according to knowledge,'—being, with divine prudence, suppressed to avoid offending the Israelites, as has often been done before in this discussion, the apostle substitutes for it this other, in which he passes from them to believers themselves, and those who call upon the name of God in truth, with the view of 'provoking the disobedient Jews to emulation,' as he openly avows further on, chap. xi. 14. From the same sorites, or series of abridged syllogisms, as in verse 14, he concludes—'that faith, which is the foundation of invocation, is both produced and increased by the hearing of the gospel preached by himself and the other apostles;' and that in this way:—

'There is ordinarily no faith without hearing; there is no hearing without a preacher; there is no preacher unless he has been sent:

'Therefore, faith is from hearing, and hearing through the word announced by the apostles, or those heralds whom God sends.'

The argument is from what equally follows, contrariwise, in the case of contradictories:*

'Without the hearing of the word preached, or where there is no hearing of the word preached, there is no faith:

'Therefore, contrariwise, or conversely, faith is from hearing, or through the word.' And this appears to be said by a sort of apostrophe,† whereby he avoids a direct reference to his opponents, the Israelites, arguing against the Church of God which has embraced the truth.

18. "But I say, have they not heard?" Next come three prolepses, in which the apostle anticipates objections arising out of the last argument: Of these, two are contained in the remainder of this chapter; the third is given in the commencement of the following.

* i. e., in modern language—'by contraposition,' or 'conversion by negation.'

† Turning aside from.

The first objection is to this effect: 'Israel has heard'—this, as being obvious, is urged in the form of a question—"Have they," the Israelities, "not heard?"

'Therefore, if faith is from hearing, and invocation unto salvation from faith, the Israelites also, believing, will be among the number of those who invoke the name of the Lord, and shall be saved.' "Yea, truly their sound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words into the ends of the world." To this first objection a twofold reply is given by the apostle. The first is expressed in these words, in which the apostle not only grants the foregoing antecedent—'that the Israelites have heard,' but also proves it by the testimony of the prophet, cited from Psalm xix. 5, (4.) This testimony may be explained in two ways; either as above, chap. i. 20, concerning 'the knowledge of the invisible things of God* from the things which he has created,' of which knowledge the prophet spoke; or, we may understand the apostle as here comparing the preaching of the gospel by those whom God has sent to preach, with the common preaching of created things, namely, —'that as created things, ever since the creation, have preached God to the whole world, in order to leave all without excuse,† so now the apostles sent forth by Christ, have preached the gospel to the whole world, in order that the elect of God may be brought to faith.' In whichever of the two ways you explain the testimony, the argument of the proof is from the less, thus:—

'The whole world has heard concerning God, either through the preaching of created things from the very beginning, or through the apostles, now that the gospel has been revealed:

'Much more, therefore, the Jews—to whom the oracles of God have been committed from the beginning, and to whom first it behoved that the gospel should be preached—have heard concerning him.'

The second reply of the apostle is a negation of the consequence, which he here passes over in silence, with that same prudence which we have often had occasion already to notice; but chiefly

* Τῶν ἀοράτων τοῦ θεοῦ. † Ἀναπολογήτους

in order that it may manifestly appear, in his reply to the second objection, that although faith is from hearing, and the Israelites also had heard, yet that they had not believed so as to invoke God unto salvation. From this the apostle would teach us—'that although faith is from hearing, yet all who hear do not believe, nor from faith invoke God unto salvation; for he proves that the Israelites had heard, and yet he has shewn that they neither believed on God, nor invoked him..

19. "But I say, hath not Israel known (God)?" By 'knowledge,' I understand here that which belongs to faith; and, accordingly, this is the second prolepsis:—

'But Israel also has known God:

'Therefore he invokes God, and shall be saved.'

The apostle denies the antecedent of this objection; and asserts what was threatened by Isaiah against this people, viz.,—that although they might hear with their ears, yet that they should not understand with their heart;' and this he here proves by a twofold testimony. "First of all Moses saith, I will provoke you to emulation by that which is not a nation; by a nation void of understanding will I provoke you to anger." This is the first testimony; from which, by a comparison of minority, the apostle thus concludes:—

'Those who are to be provoked to emulation in understanding by a nation void of understanding, do not themselves understand;

'But Moses has predicted concerning Israel, (Deut. xxxii. 21,) that he is to be provoked to emulation in understanding by a nation void of understanding:

'Therefore Israel himself does not understand.' The assumption is given in this verse.

20. "But Isaiah useth boldness, and saith, I have been found by those that sought me not, I have been made manifest to those who asked not after me.

21. "But to Israel he saith, all day long I have stretched out my hands to a people rebellious and contradictive." The second testimony is that of Isaiah, who, in chapter lxv., verses 1 and 2, testifies concerning the continual calling of Israel to grace, and his rejection of God's calling, thus:—

'That people who are rebellious and speak against God, stretching out his hands all day long, and continually calling, although they have heard concerning God, yet have not known him with the knowledge which belongs to faith;

'But "I have stretched out my hands all day long," says God, by the prophet, "to Israel, a people rebellious and contradicting:"

'Therefore, although Israel has heard, yet has he not known God.'

The assumption is given in verse 21; being illustrated in the preceding (20th verse,) by the testimony of the same prophet concerning the effectual calling on the contrary, of the Gentiles, who while not seeking God have yet found him, and to whom, while not enquiring after him and his grace, he has been made manifest.'

CHAPTER XI.

"Hath God, I say, therefore cast away his people?" This is the third prolepsis, whereby the apostle anticipates an objection arising out of the reply which he has just proved by the testimonies of Moses and Isaiah. The objection runs thus:—

'If God has been made manifest to the Gentiles, but Israel has become rebellious, and a people that speak against their God, it follows that God has cast away his people;

'But the latter is absurd:

'Therefore,' say the opponents, 'the former, which you make a shew of proving out of Moses and Isaiah, viz.—'that Israel has not known God,' must be false.'

The proposition is given at the beginning of verse 1.—"Therefore," that is, 'if, as you assert, God has been made manifest to

the Gentiles, and Israel has become rebellious against God, it follows that God has cast away his people, and that Israel has ceased to be the people of God.' The assumption also is comprised in the same words, verse 1, being implied in the interrogation—"Hath God cast away his people?" that is—'as to the latter member of the hypothetical proposition, viz., 'that God has cast away his people,' you may see to it yourself, whether you have said so.' "Far from it." To this objection the apostle replies in two ways: first, by a negation as far as verse 7; then in verse 7, by a distinction. He denies the hypothetical proposition:—'I,' says the apostle, 'do not say, nor teach, that God has cast away his people; nor does that follow, as you represent, from my preceding reply in the testimonies adduced out of Moses and Isaiah. The apostle is not content with barely announcing this negation of the proposition, but sets it off, both with a deprecation of so great a judgment upon his brethren, and with an expression of abhorrence at such blasphemy against God, as if nullifying the covenant which he himself had entered into with his people Israel; both the deprecation of the judgment, and expression of abhorrence at the blasphemy being comprised by him in this one saying—"far from it." "For I indeed am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." He goes on to prove the foregoing negation, viz.—'that God has not cast away his people;' for which purpose he employs two arguments. The first is taken from the most special species, whereby, as by an instance, he sets aside the genus or universal statement which has been denied, in this way:—

'I am an Israelite;

'But I have not been cast away by God.

'Therefore God has not cast away his people Israel.' The proposition of this syllogism is given at the end of verse 1, and proved from his procreative causes *—'Abraham and Benjamin.'

2. "God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew." This is the conclusion of the foregoing syllogism, amplified by a

* i.e. Progenitors.

definition of the people of God:—'the people of God are those whom he foreknew; and God has not cast away this his people.' By this the apostle would teach us that the true Church of God, which is also the people of God, is to be defined from God's foreknowledge, and the other "gifts without repentance"* which follow his foreknowledge and attend upon his Church (see above, chap. viii. 29, 30.) Whence it follows that the people or Church of God, in its essence or in itself, and in so far as it is the Church of God, is invisible, as the apostle intimates (chap. ii. 29), when he asserts—'that he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he who is a Jew inwardly;' the reason of which is, that the foreknowledge of God, and the rest of that grace, "without repentance," which he bestows upon his Church and whereby it is defined, is invisible. The Church being, therefore, in itself invisible, is rendered visible by external ministration, for 'to it were committed the oracles of God' (see above, chap. iii. 2); then by its effects, as our Lord teaches us, Matt. vii. 16,—"from their fruits ye shall know them." "Know ye not what the Scripture saith concerning Elijah?" The second argument by which the apostle proves 'that God has not cast away his people,' is taken from the similar example of the days of Elijah, thus:—

'In the days of Elijah, although Israel apostatized, yet amid the common apostacy of the multitude, seven thousand were preserved who did not apostatize:

'Therefore, in like manner, at this time also, although Israel is become rebellious and a people speaking against God, yet there is a reservation of God's elect.'

The antecedent of this enthymeme, or protasis of this similitude, is established by the testimony of Scripture which was known even to themselves, and consists of two parts. "How he intercedes with God against Israel, saying." The first part of the protasis, viz., the complaint of the prophet speaking against Israel, and testifying concerning the apostacy by the Visible Church, is contained in this verse.

* Ἀμεταμέλητοι.

3. "Lord! they have killed thy prophets and digged down thine altars; and I alone am left, and they seek my life." He establishes Israel's apostacy from its effects, three of which are enumerated in this verse: the first is—'the slaughter of God's prophets;' the second—'they have digged down God's altars;' the third—'that they seek me, Elijah, to put me to death;' and the third effect is heightened by the adjunct of the 'lonely position' of the prophet—'I alone am left,' says the prophet, 'and yet they seek to slay me, the only survivor;' wherefore they are guilty of the same cruelty against the true Israelites, of which the Psalmist, Ps. lxxxiii. 5 (4), accuses foreign enemies and the profane Gentiles against the nation and name of Israel.

4. "But what saith the divine answer of God unto him? I have caused to remain to myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal." This is the second part of the protasis or antecedent, and a reply to [what was hinted]—'as for the latter member of the hypothetical proposition,' viz., 'that God has cast away his people, you may see to it yourself whether or not you have said so.' The apostle replies first of all by an expression of abhorrence—'far be it from me to say that God has cast away his people.' Then by adducing the principal efficient cause of the reservation,—"I," the Lord says, "have caused to remain to myself." Lastly, in the words—"have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal," the Lord establishes his answer by an argument of disparates, thus:—

'Seven thousand have not bowed the knee to Baal:
'Therefore,' the Lord says, 'they have been reserved for me, and for my worship.'

5. "So therefore, at this time also, a reservation has been made." This is the apodosis of the similitude, or consequent of the enthymeme—'therefore, at this time also, although Israel has apostatized, yet a reservation has been made of those whom God foreknew, "according to gratuitous election." By "election," I

understand, not that whereby the reserved Israelites choose God, but that whereby God has chosen them to be reserved: for although the faithful servants of God, rejecting idols and false gods, choose the true God in Christ to be worshipped by them, as we read of Joshua and the Israelites (Josh. xxiv. 15, 16.); yet the same thing which the apostle John affirms concerning love, (1 John iv. 10.) is here to be said concerning election, viz.—'that we have not chosen God, but that he has first chosen us,' and by his election, has reserved us for himself. The apostle, therefore, here explains what was before said in the divine answer * in the 4th verse, "I have caused to remain to myself," (κατέλιπον ἐμαυτῷ) and infers the adjunct of the manner of reservation from its necessary efficient cause:—

'It is God himself who, of himself, reserves for himself whoever are reserved,'—this is asserted in the divine answer.

'Therefore, whoever are reserved, their reservation is made according to the gratuitous election of God,'—which is thence inferred, and here announced by the apostle.

6. "But if it be through grace, it is no longer from works." This is an inference and conclusion deduced from the manner of making the reservation, of which he has spoken in the preceding verse; for the apostle reasons thus:—

'If the reservation of those who, amid the common apostacy of the majority, have been reserved to righteousness and life, be through the grace of the divine election, then is their reservation not from works;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore, so is also the latter.'

The assumption of this syllogism has been already given in the preceding verse; the proposition is contained in the commencement of this verse. "Otherwise, grace is no longer grace." He goes on to prove the proposition by two arguments. The first of

* Χρηματισμῷ.

these is a *reductio ad absurdum*,* or reasoning from that which is impossible, thus:—

'If the reservation through grace were itself also from works, then grace would not be grace.

'But that grace should not be grace is impossible:

'Therefore, if the reservation be from grace, it follows that it is no longer from works.'

"But if it be from works, it is no longer grace." The second argument for the hypothetical proposition is from that which equally follows on the contrary supposition:—If the reservation were made from works, then it would not be through grace; and if the reservation were through grace, it would no longer be from the works of the law.' "Otherwise, work is no longer work." He next proves the antecedent of the last argument, as he had before proved the hypothetical proposition of the syllogism by reasoning from that which is impossible:—'Work would not be work;' and because it is impossible that contradictories should be true at the same time—a thing, however, which he must of necessity admit to be true, who asserts, either that the merit of work is gratuitous, or that the gratuitous reservation of the elect is from works. The proposition and assumption of the syllogism, therefore, having thus been proved, the conclusion or inference follows—'that reservation to life and righteousness is not from works;' which the apostle here deduces and infers, in order forcibly to impress upon the Romans the leading conclusion of the whole epistle, with which this inference is in reality identical, viz.,—'THAT THIS RIGHTEOUSNESS AND LIFE ARE THROUGH THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL.' From this I would have you observe—that neither can there be either righteousness or life to any man from the works of the law, as the Jews thought, and almost all, through a perverted zeal for the law, think still; nor can any works of the law concur with the grace of God in Jesus Christ as causes for procuring life and righteousness to man, as the Papists think—because merit and the gratuitous giving of life are so mutually opposite, that either

* Shewing that the opposite supposition lands us in absurdity.

being affirmed, the other is denied, and, on the contrary, either being denied, the other is affirmed. Whence it follows, according to the apostle, that if work be reckoned the cause of life and righteousness, grace must of necessity be set aside, because that life will be a reward from debt on account of merit, not a gratuitous gift to the undeserving; and, on the contrary, if grace be reckoned the cause of life, all the merit of every work must be set aside, because life is from grace, and a gratuitous gift bestowed on the undeserving, not a debt from the merit of works.

7. "What, therefore." Thus far we have had the first part of the reply to the objection brought forward at the commencement of the chapter, the apostle denying that God has rejected his people. This negation is here embellished with a rhetorical consultation. For, first of all, the apostle introduces his opponents still plying him with the question,—"What therefore?" as much as to say,—'What, therefore, do you reply to the objection?' "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for." This is the hypophora or subjoined reply of the apostle to the preceding question of his opponents, and the second part of the reply to the objection. In this reply he first of all admits the rejection of Israel, or the people of God; which must be understood of Israel according to the flesh only: for, as there is one Jew who is a Jew outwardly, and another who is a Jew inwardly, (chap. ii. 28, 29,) so there is one Israel in the Spirit, and another in the flesh only, such as the great majority of that people were in the time of Paul, and are still; consequently, he gives the name of 'Israel' to those who were rejected, and says,—'that Israel has not obtained that he was seeking, viz. righteousness, and life from righteousness. He then replies most appositely to the objection by a distinction. "But the elect have obtained it,"—this is the first member of the distinction; "and those left have become callous,"—the second member of the distinction. Here observe, in the first place, that as the apostle divides the Jews into him who is a Jew inwardly, and him who is a Jew outwardly, (chap. ii. 28, 29,) and the seed

of Abraham into the children of the flesh, and the children of the promise, (chap. ix. 7, 8;) so he divides the Israelites into "the elect," and "those left." By "the elect" are intended—'those whom, along with Jacob, before they were born, or had done any thing good or bad, (chap. ix. 11, 12, 13,) [God] chose to be conformed to the image of his Son,' (chap. viii. 29:) by "those left" he means—'the reprobate, who, being without election, have been left behind to sin and death.' Observe again, that in the first member of the distinction, the apostle does not say that 'the elect have,' but that "the election has obtained it;" for such is the force of the expression in the original, (ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν:) and he speaks by metonymy on purpose, in order to teach us that the cause of our righteousness and life is neither merit nor faith in the elect themselves, but is in God, viz. his election of them before the world was. I would have you observe, in the third place, that in the second member of the distinction, he does not say that 'those left have not obtained it,' that is, 'have not obtained life, but that they "have become callous;" and that with a view to teach us two things. First, he would teach us that the wicked are not punished with death until they have deserved it by sinning. Secondly, that the wicked, by sinning, contract such a habit of sinning, that at length they rush into sin without remorse, and become hardened in heart against every admonition whereby they are invited to return to a better life. This is expressed by the metaphorical term—ἐπωρώθησαν, "they have become callous;" for πῶρος, or 'callus,' is a white, hard, dry substance, whereby broken bones are united, which grows upon the body contrary to nature, like hard skin, and is so hurtful to the joints or lungs, that they become unfit for their natural motion: by the word ἐπωρώθησαν, therefore, something similar in the wicked Jews, whereby they became so hardened, as to be unfitted for every motion of the life of God, and for every good work, is intended.

8. "According as it is written." In the three following verses he both proves and amplifies the latter member of the distinction,

viz.—'that those Jews left behind by election have become callous.' The proof is drawn from the written word, for the apostle speaks thus—"According as it is written." And in the same way most proofs of the New Testament are adduced, both by Christ and his apostles; for in John, verse 39, our Lord appeals to the written word—"Search the scriptures:' and in Acts xxvi. 32, the apostle professes before Agrippa, in the presence of a numerous assembly, that he said and taught nothing in the preaching of the New Testament, except those things which Moses and the prophets, in the written word, had foretold should happen. "God hath given them a spirit of deep sleep." Three scripture testimonies are adduced to prove the hardening of the Jews: of these this is the first, from Isaiah xxix. 10. "Eyes that they should not see, ears that they should not hear:" this is the second testimony, from Isaiah vi. 9.

9. and 10. "And David saith," &c. This is the third testimony from Psalm lxix. 22, 23. These testimonies prove two things: (1.) that the Jews have become callous; (2.) that those who have become callous are left behind by election; for God does not give a spirit of deep sleep, &c., to the elect. The spirit of God, therefore, thus reasons:—

'Those to whom a spirit of deep sleep has been given by God become callous, and are hardened thereby:

'But God gives a spirit of deep sleep, &c., to those Jews that are left behind,' as appears from the testimonies that have been adduced:

'Therefore those Jews that are left behind have become callous, and have been hardened.' The latter member of the distinction is thus proved in these three verses; in the same verses it is also amplified by the apostle, partly by a definition of the hardening (τοῦ πωρῶσθαι); partly by its efficient cause, and partly by the adjunct of the time. The definition and cause are both sufficiently obvious in the testimonies by which the hardening is proved.

First, as regards the definition, "hardening" (πῶρος) is 'a

spiritual callus,' or spirit of deep sleep, so stopping up the eyes, ears and mind, as it is there said in the prophet, 'that the table of those who are in this condition becomes a snare, a trap, and a retribution, and their backs always remain bowed down;' a definition which is made up of the genus—"a spirit," and specific difference —"of deep sleep." This is explained by its various effects, of which the first is—'the darkening of the eyes of their mind,' 'the hardening and (as the prophet speaks) making fat of their heart;' the second—'the turning of their table into a trap and a retribution;' the third—'the perpetual bowing down of their back.' Comparing these effects together, we shall see, in the first place, that 'not to see the things which they see, not to hear the things which they hear, and not to perceive the things which they understand,' is at once their sin and their judgment: it is their sin, in their abuse of the ministry; for either to neglect or despise the word of God when heard, his works when seen, and his grace when offered, which is 'not to hear the word heard, not to see the works seen, and not to perceive the grace offered to the understanding,' is to abuse the ministry, and is the sin of those who abuse it; and it is their judgment, inasmuch as in the time of the long-suffering of God, and his gracious visitation of them—"the things which belong to their peace are hid from their eyes."

The second effect, namely,—'that their table should become a trap and a retribution,' is their judgment only begun; which, as it turns out for good to the elect, so it turns out for evil to those that are left behind. The third effect denotes their judgment, and their judgment complete, as appears both from the severity of the judgment, which is—'the bowing down of their back,' and from its continued duration—"bow down their back always."

But for the clearer understanding both of the definition itself, and of this comparison of effects, we must briefly explain some of the words which occur in the testimonies. The first word requiring explanation is—κατανυξις, [literally] 'a deep sleep like night,' whereby is denoted a most profound lethargy, such as deprives those who are under it of all sense of their own advantage. This

deep sleep had so spread among the inhabitants of Jerusalem, during the time of Christ's walking in the flesh, that it caused him to weep when he approached and looked upon that city, (Luke xix. 42.) "When he drew near and beheld the city, he wept over it, and said, Oh, that thou knewest, at least in this thy day, the things that belong to thy peace, but now (these things) are hid from thine eyes." Then the apostle does not say that God gave them 'deep sleep,' but "a spirit of deep sleep," to teach us that, as God distributes his gifts to his people through his own Spirit dwelling in them, as it is written, (1 Cor. xii. 4,) "There are diversities of gifts, but (there is) one Spirit;" so he inflicts his judgments upon those who are left behind through evil spirits, as the avengers of sin and ministers of wrath. Both these truths are clearly set forth in the Scriptures; the first in Isaiah xi. 2, where you will find—"the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah,"—put for—'wisdom and understanding, counsel and might, knowledge and the fear of Jehovah, proceeding from the indwelling Holy Spirit of Jehovah;' the latter in 1 Tim. iv. 1, where the apostle himself explains what he means by "deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons," namely—'false doctrine, by the just judgment of God, put into the mouths of false teachers by means of devils and evil spirits—just as we read in 1 Kings xxii. 21, 22, 23, of a lie being suggested by an evil spirit to the prophets of Ahab, to persuade Ahab to his own destruction. In the same way, throughout the Scriptures, 'a spirit of infirmity,' 'of fornication,' 'of covetousness,' 'of giddiness,'* are put for these evils proceeding from God through an evil spirit. Thus, in 1 Sam. xvi. 15, it is said that "an evil spirit from Jehovah troubled Saul;" and, in Mark ix. 17, one who had been struck by God, through an evil spirit, with inability to speak, (ἀλαλία,) is spoken of as having "a dumb spirit;" but this most manifestly appears from Matt. xii. 43, where, by the "unclean spirit going out," is denoted—'the uncleanness expelled for a time by the power of the ministry;'

* *Vertiginis*, Vulg. ver. of Isaiah xix. 14; Eng. ver.—'a perverse spirit.'

for the unclean spirit himself, where he has once been expelled by the power of a stronger than he, namely, of the Holy Spirit, never returns thither again. An "unclean spirit," therefore, is 'uncleanness proceeding from an unclean spirit,' which being broken off for a time by the power of the ministry, the spirit himself, from whom it proceeds, appears to have been expelled from hypocrites. And from Luke xiii. 11, where 'the infirmity of being bowed down' is called—"a spirit of infirmity," which is explained in verse 16, where we are told that "Satan had bound" the wretched woman therewith. When the apostle, therefore, quoting from the prophet, says—"God hath given them a spirit of deep sleep," the meaning is—'that God, by means of evil spirits, as the avengers of the sins of this people, and the ministers of his own wrath, has inflicted upon them a total insensibility to their own advantage, and to the day of their merciful visitation.' In the third place, the word "table" demands our consideration here. "Table" is 'that which serves for nourishment,' but is in this place transferred from external to internal nourishment. By "table," therefore, I understand here—'the sacrifices of this people, and all the service of the law,' which was given for life, and for the nourishment of spiritual life, (chap. vii. 10,) but yet became a snare and death to this people, according to the prophetic imprecation of the Psalmist; namely, because, through a perverted zeal for the sacrifices and service of the law, that people rejected Jesus Christ, "the end of the law," offered to them in the gospel. Fourthly, the apostle says that their table would become not only a snare, but also a "retribution," whereby he would intimate that this judgment, viz., 'that the law should become a snare to them,' is the just recompense (ἀνταπόδομα) of their sin; for, as they perverted the sacrifices and service of the law to another end than that for which the law was given by God, so it is a retribution and just compensation from God, that the sacrifices and service of the law should serve another end to them than that for which God gave them the law. The law was given as a "child leader to Christ," (Gal. iii. 24); when, therefore, through zeal for the law, they reject Christ, the

just reward of their error is, that the law which was given for a table, or spiritual nourishment, should become a snare. The last expression to be considered here is, "the bowing down of the back," which metaphorically denotes—'the judgment of those who lie under, and sink beneath, the intolerable burden of the wrath of God.' The definition of 'hardening,' therefore, is this—'a spirit of deep sleep, or a deep sleep inflicted by God through an evil spirit, so closing the eyes, ears, and mind against the ministry of the word, that the very table itself, *i. e.*, the sacred ministry of the word, which should be for spiritual nourishment, becomes death to those who are in this condition, and being thus dead, they remain under wrath for ever.'

The hardening of the Jews is next amplified from its cause, which also is indicated in the testimonies to be the 'giving,' 'making,' 'bowing down,' whereby God gives them a spirit of deep sleep, makes their table a snare, and bows down their backs. If it be inquired—what is meant by this 'giving?' I answer—it is 'the effectual execution of the will of God, whereby, from eternity, they have been made those left by election, their own abuse of the sacred ministry of the word intervening;' for although they were made those left by election before they had a being, because it is not only written—"Jacob have I loved," but also—"Esau have I hated," yet, previous to their being afflicted with this hardening, and before that spirit of deep sleep is given to them, they reject the knowledge of God and the love of the truth, as the apostle says, c. i. 21, 26—"because that though they knew God, they glorified him not as God, therefore God abandoned them to vile affections," and, 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12—"because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved, therefore God sends to them the effectual working of error, that they may believe a lie, and that all may be condemned who have not believed the truth, but have had pleasure in unrighteousness." The cause of this hardening, therefore, is of three degrees: the proximate cause is—'the judgment of God, whereby a spirit of deep sleep is given or sent to them.' Prior to this is the cause of that judgment or sending,

viz.—'their own rejection of the truth of God,' to both of which Jude says, that they were "foreordained of old," (πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι,) (Jude iv.) indicating the most remote and primary cause.

The last part of the amplification is taken from the adjunct of the time, at the close of verse 8,—"even unto this day;" which words must be connected with the last clause of verse 7—"have become callous," the preceding words in verse 8 being included within a parenthesis. The same thing is affirmed by the apostle in 2 Cor. iii. 13, 14, from the typical nature of the law: Moses put a veil on his face while announcing the law, thereby intimating to the Jews, that the end of the law, which is Christ, lay hid in a mystery, under the enwrapment or covering, as it were, of the law, which veil was not to be taken away except in Christ; whence he infers the same thing as he here asserts, namely—'that their minds were hardened, and that the veil remained upon their hearts, in the reading of the Old Testament, even to this day, nor would be taken away until their hearts should be converted to Christ.' This conversion we do not yet witness even to the present day—as the apostle speaks of his own age—in the case of the great majority of this nation. The Lord convert both them and us, that the riches of his goodness in Jesus Christ may be glorified in the fulness of the world!

11. "I say." We have here the second argument, by which the apostle proves that the Israelites are to be restored to the God of their salvation, taken from the end of their fall, and that fourfold; thus:—

'If the Jews and Israelites in general, who were formerly the people of God and his visible Church, have yet stumbled against his Christ—(1.) that through their fall, salvation might come to the Gentiles, (2.) that they themselves might be provoked to emulation on seeing the salvation of the Gentiles, (3.) that through emulation of the Gentiles some of them might be saved, and (4.) that their salvation might be the fulness of the Church of God—then the Jews and Israelites in general are to be recalled to Christ, notwithstanding their rejection of him;

'But the former—viz., that the Israelites have stumbled for that fourfold end—is true: 'Therefore they are to be recalled.'

The proposition is omitted as obvious; the assumption consists in an enumeration in verses 11 and 12, of the ends for which the Jews were given over to their own counsel, so as to stumble against Christ the author of their salvation. "Whether have they stumbled, or—"whether therefore have they stumbled," &c. The first end is here illustrated by a contrast:—'the Jews have not stumbled against Christ that they should fall away from God; but that through their fall salvation might come to the Gentiles.' "Far from it." He proves the arsis and first member of the contrast by his own effect, in devoutly expressing his aversion to, and abhorrence of the falling away of the Jews—'May God avert so great a judgment from his people, as that the Jews should stumble against Christ for this end, to fall away from God;' whence what is here expressed in the Greek idiom, by the words—"far from it" (μὴ γένοιτο), is in the Syriac version expressed by a form of prayer—"Do thou spare:" this is also the commencement of the hypophora or subjoined reply, in rhetorical consultation; which reply consists of two parts, of which this expression of aversion to so great a judgment is the first. "But through their fall," &c. This is the thesis and second member of the contrast, wherein we have the true and positive end for which the Jews stumbled against Christ; and it is at the same time the second part of the hypophora or subjoined reply to the question—"Whether," &c., at the beginning of the verse, "To provoke them to emulation." This is the second end for which the Jews stumbled against Christ, namely—'that by the Gentiles drawing near to God in Christ, and believing the Gospel, the Jews might be moved to anger and provoked to emulation, for a recompense, and that God might recompense * their iniquity, in moving to anger the God of their salvation, by their idolatry and vanities;' see Deut. xxxii. 21,—"they have moved me to jealousy by those things which are not the mighty (God); they have provoked me by their vanities: I also will move

* Εἰς ἀντιμισθίαν.

them to jealousy by that which is not a people; I will provoke them by a foolish nation."

12. "But if the fall of them," &c. This is the fourth end for which the Jews stumbled; for the third, namely—'that some of them might be saved,' is omitted here, to be more conveniently expressed afterwards in verse 14: the Jews, therefore, stumbled against Jesus Christ, the Lord of their salvation: fourthly, that their fulness might be the fulness and completion of the Church. This end is proved from the first, by reasoning from the less to the greater, in this way:—

'If the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, much more shall their fulness be the riches of the world, and of the whole Church of God; 'But the former is true'—as we have seen in the first end:

'Therefore so is the latter.' The proposition is contained in this verse; the assumption is proved in the next two verses; and the conclusion follows in verse 15. But to return to verse 12, by "the fall," and "the diminishing," of the Jews the apostle means—the rejection of the gospel, and of Christ offered therein, by the majority of that nation;' and by "the riches of the world," and "of the Gentiles," he means—'their drawing near to God by embracing the gospel, and Christ therein:' whence I would have you observe—that the diminishing and riches, either of a people, or of individuals from among a people, are to be estimated by the possession or want of Jesus Christ, offered in the gospel; so that, he who possesses Christ is rich, and, on the contrary, he who is without Christ as he is offered in the gospel, is diminished.

13. "For," &c. He goes on to prove the preceding assumption, and that the Israelites have stumbled against Jesus Christ, offered to them in the gospel, for the ends aforesaid; the argument being taken from the effect of Paul directed towards these same ends:—

'I honour my ministry, to try if, by any means, I may provoke my kinsmen to emulation, and may save some of them:

'Therefore, the Israelites have stumbled for these ends."

"In that I speak to you," &c. The words inclosed within this parenthesis are a prolepsis, of two parts, whereby the effect of Paul in discharging his ministry is explained: first, it is shewn how Paul honours his ministry; and then how that ministry which he honours can be said to be *his*. In regard to the former, he says—'I honour my ministry in this that I say these things to you Gentiles,' that is, 'inasmuch as I assert that the Jews have stumbled for the salvation of you Gentiles, in order that they being moved to emulate you, may return to the God of their salvation.' As regards the other, he says,—'I call this ministry *mine*, because, as an apostle, I have been sent by the Lord to the Gentiles.'

14. "To try if by any means," &c. We have here the two ends on account of which Paul honours his ministry, illustrated by the adjunct of their difficulty. The first end is—'the provoking of his kinsmen to emulation;' the second, which, having been previously omitted, is here expressed—'the salvation of some of them through that emulation.' The difficulty of both is expressed by his saying—"if by any means I may provoke," or 'may be able to provoke.'

15. "For if the casting away," &c. This is the conclusion, illustrated by a similitude, and proved by reasoning from the less to the greater. The conclusion relating to the reception of the Jews is illustrated from the like—'it will be, as it were, a resurrection of the dead: for by that type the prophet has illustrated their restoration from Babylon (Ezek. xxxvii. 1;) and in the same way the apostle here illustrates their restoration from unbelief* and the power of Satan, which also is Babylonian bondage in a spiritual sense. The conclusion thus illustrated, is proved, as above, from the less, in the following way:—

* Ἀπιστία.

'If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world; much more shall their reception be, as it were, a resurrection from death.'

16. "But if," &c. This is the third argument whereby the apostle proves that the Israelites are to be recalled to God, and will embrace Jesus Christ. The argument is taken from the adjunct of the 'sanctification' of that nation; by which sanctification I understand—'the separation from all the nations, and consecration of that people, whereby, being separated from all the nations, they might be consecrated to their God, and might become to him—"a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and a people restored unto liberty, to shew forth the praises of him who called them out of darkness into his marvellous light," as the apostle Peter, 1st Eph. ii. 9, quotes from Exod. xix. 6. Accordingly he thus reasons:—

'Whosoever are holy, are to be recalled out of the world unto the God of their salvation in Christ;

'But both the people of Israel, and the last of the stock of Israel, are holy:

'Therefore the Israelites are to be recalled to God.'

The proposition is omitted as obvious; the assumption is proved in this 16th verse; whence follows the conclusion—'the Israelites are to be recalled.' The proof of the assumption consists of two parts; for he first proves that the mass of the Israelites, and then that the branches are holy: by "the mass," I understand—the majority of that people; and by "the branches,"—'the last of their posterity.' In both parts of the proof the language is metaphorical. In the first part, the metaphor is taken, either from the sheaf of new corn which the priest waved before Jehovah at the beginning of autumn, as the first fruits of harvest, for the acceptance of the people; or from those first fruits which were offered to God after the seven weeks of harvest, when it was requisite that it should be unlawful for any one to eat either parched or green ears, of the new corn of the year, before the offering

of these first fruits, in order that the rest of the mass might be sanctified for the use of God's people, (see Lev. xxiii., verses 9-22. 'The first fathers of the Israelites,' Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, are, therefore, here compared to the first fruits; because, as in the offering of these first fruits unto God, the whole "mass was sanctified, so 'Israel' was holy, and, therefore, beloved in these fathers; as the apostle afterwards explains in verse 28—"as regards the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes; but, as regards election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes." In the latter part of the proof, again, the metaphor is taken from trees, in which, of whatever sort the root may be, such will also be the natural branches: here, too, therefore, 'the first fathers' are compared to the root, and 'their posterity down to the latest,' to the branches. This metaphor is transferred by the apostle to this place, out of Isaiah xi. 1, where 'Jesse the Bethlehemite, the father of David,' is compared to "the root;" and 'Jesus Christ, the son of David,' to the "branch" or "scion:" whence, in Zech. iii. 8, he is styled—a "sprout;" and, further, to shew that he is the last scion, (Isaiah iv. 2,)—"the sprout of Jehovah," because he was raised up by God the Father, in the Son, through the Spirit, from the decayed kingdom of David, like a new sprout germinating afresh from a root.

17. "But if," &c. This is a prolepsis, wherein the apostle replies to a twofold objection of the Gentiles against the Jews, and their recal (above concluded in verse 15,) to the God of their salvation through the gospel. As the Gentiles were a reproach to the Jews so long as the ministry of the law continued among the latter, as this same apostle testifies in Eph. ii. 11; and Peter in Acts x. 18; so the apostle foreseeing that the Jews, as rejecting Christ, would be a reproach to the Gentiles who had professed Christ, and knowing that this would not be to the advantage, but to the serious injury of the Jews, since they would thence take occasion to oppose the gospel the more, endeavours to anticipate the evil by refuting the objections which he foresaw that the Gen-

tiles would bring against the Jews; and these, as we have said, are two. The first objection is this:—

'The Jews, by rejecting Christ, have been broken off and fallen away, like withered branches from their root:

'Although, therefore, the root and the first fruits of the nation be holy, yet they themselves are not holy, nor to be recalled to God.'

"And you being a wild olive," &c. The second objection which he foresaw that the Gentiles would bring against the Jews is set forth by opposites, and is to this effect:—

'Although I have hitherto been a wild olive,' some one of the Gentiles might say, 'yet am I now engrafted into the true olive-tree, and that in place of the Jews who were broken off as withered branches; and I have become a partaker of the root which you say is holy, instead of those who were broken off:

'Therefore I am to remain in the root, and the Jews are not to be recalled.'

These are the objections of the Gentiles against the Jews, to which the apostle here replies, and his reply consists of two parts. The first given in this 17th verse contains a concession, whereby the apostle concedes to the Gentiles the two following things: First, he concedes 'that the Jews were broken off as withered branches;' yet by way of softening this apostacy of the Jews as a check to the triumphing of the Gentiles over them, he says, by melosis,*—that "*some* of the branches were broken off." The second thing which he concedes is this—'that they themselves, namely, the Gentiles, have been engrafted into the root of the Jews, and made partakers of the fatness of the true olive-tree;' as it is also elsewhere said, without a figure—that "they who are of faith are the children of Abraham," (Gal. iii. 7.)

18. "Yet glory not," &c. This is the latter part of the reply, in which, by epanorthosis, he admonishes the Gentiles, 'although engrafted into the true olive, yet not to glory against the branches.'

* Softening.

By "the branches" I understand—'the natural branches of the true olive,' that is—'the Jews;' from this glorying of theirs against whom the Gentiles are interdicted by a twofold admonition. For when the apostle says—"glory not," the meaning is—'take care that you do not either glory concerning their being broken off, nor glory yourself, whosoever you are of the Gentiles, after the flesh,* and through carnal pride, concerning your own engrafting into the root of the true olive, instead of the Jews, who are the branches broken off.' The latter he brings forward as the topic of the next admonition, wherein, replying, as it were, a second time to the Gentiles, he exhorts them not to glory; the argument being taken from the subject of the glorying, illustrated by a contrast:—

'That glorying wherewith you, whosoever you are of the Gentiles, glory against the Jews, belongs not to you, but to the Jews:

'Therefore do not glory.'

He proves the antecedent from the subject of the glorying:—

'That glorying of yours, whosoever you are of the Gentiles, is concerning the root;

'But the root is not your root, but the root of the Jews:

'Therefore, that glorying of yours, whosoever you are of the Gentiles, wherewith you glory against the Jews, is vain.'

He proves the proposition by the effects of the root:—

'The root bears thee:

'Therefore your glorying is concerning the root.'

"Thou bearest not the root." He next proves the second member of the contrast, viz.—'that that glorying belongs not to the Gentiles themselves.' The argument is taken from the negative effect or disparate—"Thou bearest not the root;" and the apostle thus reasons:—

'If you, whosoever you are of the Gentiles, bear the root of the true olive and of the Jews, into which you have been engrafted, the honour would belong to you, and not to the Jews;

'But you do not bear the root, but the root you:

'Therefore, the honour that you have been engrafted into the

* Κατὰ σάρκα.

root, and made a partaker of the true olive, belongs not to you, but to the Jews.'

19. "Thou wilt say, therefore," &c. This is a second prolepsis, wherein the apostle replies to a third objection of the Gentiles in reference to their glorying against the Israelites, and their recal to the God of their salvation. "The branches were broken off," &c. This objection of the Gentiles is taken from the end of the rejection of the Jews:—

'The Jews were rejected, and, as branches broken off, have fallen away from their root, that I, who am of the Gentiles, might be engrafted into the same:

'Therefore, neither are they to be recalled, nor am I to be rejected from the root, and I must boast against them concerning my engrafting into the true olive.'

The consequence of [this objection] of the Gentiles rests upon the philosophical and common maxim—that 'when we have attained the end, we must not look beyond it:

'Wherefore, since they were broken off for this end, that I might be engrafted, it is necessary to stop at my engrafting, nor must the recal of the Jews be urged beyond it.'

The hypophora, or subjoined reply to the foregoing objection, is contained in this verse, and consists of two parts:—The first part of the reply is the granting of the antecedent, namely—'that the Jews were rejected, and have become branches broken off for this end, that the Gentiles might be engrafted in their room.'

20. "By unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith." We have here the second part of the reply, wherein he refutes the assertion, either—'that the Gentiles are to boast on that account,' or 'that there is to be no recal of the Jews,' and so denies the consequence of the objection of the Gentiles. The argument is drawn from the causes both of the rejection of the Jews, and of the engrafting of the Gentiles. On the one hand, he assigns, as the cause of the rejection of the Jews, and that on account

of which they have become branches broken off—'the unbelief (ἀπιστίαν) of the Jews;' and, on the other, he points to 'the faith (πίστιν) whereby Christ and the blessing of Abraham in him, are apprehended,' as the cause of the engrafting of the Gentiles. From these causes he thus reasons:—

'If they have fallen away by unbelief, and you stand by faith, you must not glory against them as not to be recalled, but should fear for yourself, lest, like them, you fall away from the root by unbelief;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is the latter.'

The hypothetical proposition is omitted as obvious; for it is clear that he who stands by faith, and sees others falling by unbelief, should take heed to himself, lest he, in like manner, disbelieve, but ought not to glory against those who fall by unbelief, as being himself exposed to the same danger with them. The assumption is contained in the words quoted:—"Be not high-minded, but fear." This is the conclusion of the hypothetical syllogism, where, by 'high-mindedness,' we are to understand—the presumptuous glorying of the Gentiles against the Jews; while the 'fear' which he recommends to them is—that of children, whereby believers fear, lest, through sinful glorying, either against God or against another, they should, as a recompense,* be deprived of God's presence and favour.

21. "For if God spared not the natural branches, [take heed] lest he also spare not thee." This is the second argument, whereby he proves the inconclusiveness of the objection of the Gentiles, namely—'that the Gentiles ought not to glory against the Jews, because they have fallen away from their root by unbelief, but should rather fear for themselves, lest they disbelieve in like manner.' The argument is taken from the adjunct of the severity of God in punishing unbelief, which the apostle proves that the Gentiles should fear, by a comparison of majority, in this way:—

* ἀντιμισθίαν.

'If God did not spare the natural branches disbelieving, but cast them out from their root, much less will he spare you who are a wild olive, if you reject the faith in like manner with them;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is also the latter;' that is—'God will not spare you of the Gentiles disbelieving:

'Wherefore, (for there is here a prosyllogism,) you should take heed to yourself, lest you fall away from the faith; but you must not boast against the disbelieving Jews.' The proposition only is given in the text.

22. "Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God," &c. This is a corollary and conclusion deduced from the preceding discussion, in which corollary he recommends to the consideration of the Gentiles both the goodness and severity of God. By "severity" I understand 'the judgment of God against the unyielding,' a judgment most just indeed, yet especially to be dreaded; under the name of "goodness," again, I understand all those most desirable effects of the gratuitous favour of God, which he graciously confers upon his beloved, and which are chiefly, and above all other things, both to be sought after and retained by the elect of God, or believers. "Towards those who have fallen, indeed, severity, but towards thee, goodness." The apostle illustrates both the severity and goodness of God by their subjects, or the objects towards which they are manifested: that of the severity is explained to be—'the nation of the Jews who have fallen away from their root:' that of the goodness—'every one of the Gentiles who has embraced Christ by faith.' "If thou shalt abide in his goodness." This is an epanorthosis whereby he corrects what he has just said of the goodness of God towards the Gentiles, and warns them that that goodness of God will not be continued to the Gentiles any longer than they shall abide in that goodness. 'To abide in the goodness of God,' moreover, as the apostle uses the term "goodness" in this place, is 'by keeping the faith to stand fast in Christ, for whose sake, and in whom, God has become good

to the Gentiles, as he formerly chose the Israelites, 'before all the nations, in the same,' (Deut. vii. 7, 8); whence, in 2 Tim. iv. 7, this same apostle, in the near prospect of death, congratulates himself, in the Lord, that he has "kept the faith." We ought also to observe here, in passing, that the apostle does not call in question the perseverance in the true faith of those who are truly believers: for he himself teaches that that has been made certain by God, since, speaking of individuals, those who are once in Christ through faith, always remain in Christ; but addressing all the Gentiles as one man, he warns them that they would enjoy the goodness of God no longer than they themselves should remain in the state of those whom God follows with his goodness; for although it be true, speaking of individuals, that those who are once in God's goodness shall always abide in that goodness, yet is that not true of any whole nation, because, a nation which now professes the faith of Christ, may afterwards fall away from the same, of which we have an example in the case of the churches of the East, so distinguished in the times of the apostles.

23. "But they also shall be engrafted, if they abide not in unbelief." This is a second epanorthosis, whereby he corrects what he has said in the corollary, concerning the severity of God against the Jews; namely 'that they themselves also shall be delivered, and again engrafted into their own root, if they abide not in their unbelief.' This, too, in like manner, is to be understood, not of the reprobate Jews individually, for the decree of reprobation also is immutable, but of the nation, which, when the apostle wrote this epistle, was obstinately going on in unbelief, and therefore experienced the severity of God: and he hereby teaches, that the nation of the Jews is to be delivered, if they themselves persist not in unbelief. "For God is able to engraft them again." He proceeds to prove the foregoing epanorthosis, by an argument drawn from the ability of God. By "God," in this place, he means 'God become theirs according to his covenant with their fathers;' otherwise the argument from 'being able' to 'being,' or

from 'being able to be engrafted,' to 'being engrafted,' or 'actual future engrafting,' would not hold good. For God is *able* to do things which he neither *wills* to do, nor is ever at any time *about* to do; as when it is said in Matt. iii. 9,—"God is able from these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," which, however, he neither wills to do, nor ever shall do: but what good things he is able to confer, these he shall confer upon his own, according to his own good will; wherefore, the apostle proves, from the ability of God, that as many of the Jews as abide not in unbelief, having been reconciled in Christ, shall be engrafted again into their own root.

24. "For if thou wert cut out of the olive which is wild by nature, and hast been engrafted, contrary to nature, into the true olive; how much more shall these, which are the natural branches, be engrafted into their own olive?" He goes on to prove that God is able to engraft the Jews again, by a comparison of their second engrafting with that first engrafting of the Gentiles:—

'If God was able to engraft the Gentiles into the root of the Jews, much more shall he be able to engraft the Jews again into their own root;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is also the latter.'

The argument here is from the less to the greater. The proposition is given in the text; and is proved by the apostle by a comparison of dissimilarity between the Gentiles and Jews, as also between the engrafting of the Jews and Gentiles respectively:—

'The Gentiles were branches transferred from the wild olive, but the Jews were the proper and natural branches of the true olive; and the Gentiles are engrafted into a strange olive, contrary to nature; but the engrafting of the Jews will be as that of the natural branches into their own olive-tree:

'If therefore God was able to engraft the Gentiles into the root of the Jews, much more shall he be able to engraft the Jews themselves into their own root.'

25. We have here the fourth argument by which the apostle proves that the Jews are to be recalled to the God of their salvation. The argument is taken from the contrary, and the adjunct of the contrary: 'the hardening of the Jews' is contrary to their recal; and the adjunct of the hardening is here represented as consisting in two things—1st, it is 'in part,' and 2dly, it is 'for a time.' Hence, therefore, the apostle thus reasons:—

'Those who have been rejected, or hardened, in part merely, or for a time only, are to be recalled in their own time;

'But the Jews have been rejected in part only, and for a definite time:

'Therefore they are to be recalled in their own time.'

"For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery." The apostle first illustrates the assumption of the foregoing syllogism, viz.—'that hardening has happened to Israel in part, and for a time,' from its genus: it is a "mystery," or 'a thing known only to those to whom it has been revealed from God.' He then proves this mystery, or secret revealed from God, by the adjunct of apostolical authority; and that—with a view to move the Gentiles the more—embellished with a rhetorical wish.

'I Paul, both an apostle and prophet of the New Testament, announce this to you Gentiles as a mystery, or secret revealed from God, which I would that you Gentiles also should not be ignorant of, namely, that hardening has happened to Israel in part, and for a time:

'Therefore you are thus to judge, and to know upon apostolical authority, that hardening in part, and for a time, has happened to Israel.'

"Lest ye be wise in your own eyes." In passing, he inserts, within a parenthesis, the reason for which he has revealed to them this mystery, and why he wishes the Gentiles not to be ignorant of it. The argument is drawn from the end, thus:—'I announce this mystery to you Gentiles, and would not that you should be ignorant of it, lest you be wise in your own judgment,' that is, 'lest, contrary to the command of Christ, (Matt. xi. 29,) and con-

trary to the genius of the gospel, (1 Cor. viii. 2,) you, who have been called to Christ from among the Gentiles, should either be proud on account of your knowledge of Christ, or should triumph over the Jews as ignorant of him.' "That hardening in part has happened to Israel." This is the assumption itself of the syllogism, which, in the words immediately preceding, the apostle has both amplified and proved. This assumption consists of two parts. The first is this—'hardening has happened to Israel in part only,' (ἀπὸ μέρους.) This 'hardening in part merely,' is opposed to universal apostacy, in the manner of inferior contraries or subalternates: for the Jews were hardened, during the time of hardening, not universally, (καθ' ὅλον,) but only in part; so that the elect continued unhardened, whilst those left by election became callous, as he himself speaks in verse 7 of this very chapter, and has proved in the first six verses, both by his own example, and by a comparison of similarity with the times of Elijah. Wherefore, from a comparison of this passage with that prophecy of this same apostle concerning the future apostacy of the Gentiles, where it is said 'that the day of the second coming of Jesus Christ will not arrive, except there first come an apostacy of the Gentiles also,' the apostle wishes to shew, that even as regards apostacy itself, the condition of the Jews is better than that of the Gentiles; since he predicts that there will be an apostacy of them also, and that without even the addition of the note of limitation, (ἀπὸ μέρους). The apostle, however, does not intend to intimate by this prediction of an universal apostacy of the Gentiles, that there will be none of God's elect remaining among them under Antichrist: for when, in the same place, (2 Thess. ii.) he afterwards predicts that Antichrist 'shall be consumed by the spirit of Christ's mouth,' he certainly foretells that during the whole time of the darkness of Antichrist, a part of the Gentiles shall remain and be reserved among the elect; through means of which, Antichrist, in his own time, is to be gradually consumed, the flame having been kindled by the Spirit of God, until he be destroyed by the brightness of the coming of the Lord himself. The comparison

here, therefore, is not of individuals from among the Gentiles, but of individual Gentile nations with individual Jews; and the apostle's meaning is:—'that the apostacy of the Gentiles, under the tyranny and darkness of Antichrist, will proceed so far, that there shall be no entire and whole nation among them which shall preserve the light of the gospel pure; whilst, on the contrary, in the falling away of the Jewish nation, there shall remain among them both many sons of light, and even some sincere preachers of the gospel,' of whom, the apostle, in the first verse of this chap., professes himself to be one, and, in our own day, we have seen Immanuel Tremellius to be another. The apostle, moreover, purposely makes the comparison in this way; and, here, when he is speaking of the hardening of the Jews, expresses the note of limition (ἀπὸ μέρους) which he omitted in predicting the apostacy of the Gentiles, in order that he may the more effectually repress (which is the design of this passage) the triumphing of the Gentiles against the Jews. "Until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in." This is the second part of the assumption, the meaning of which is—'that hardening has happened to Israel, not for ever, nor until the end, but for a definite portion of future time.' This portion of time the apostle defines by its subject—'the coming in of the fulness of the Gentiles,' that is 'the drawing near of all the Gentiles, or the elect out of individual Gentile nations, to Jesus Christ their Saviour, through the gospel call;' which coming in, or drawing near of the Gentiles, the Lord predicts, in Matt. xxiv. 14, would precede the end and his second coming. The mystery, therefore, which the apostle here announces to the Gentiles, is this:—'that God has defined the number which he is about to call out of all the Gentiles, by the preaching of the gospel of the kingdom, that they may become partakers of the grace of Christ; and that, although in themselves, these called from among the Gentiles are not a people, and a rebellious people, yet, being led, through the gospel, to the obedience of faith, they shall become the people of God, in order that the Jews, who have been hardened until the fulness of the Gen-

tiles, may be provoked to emulation by their example,' (Deut. xxxii. 21; Rom. x. 19; xi. 14.) the fulness of the Gentiles having been thus brought in, the apostle says—'that there will be an end, or that the hardening of the Jews also will cease, and that they shall be recalled, so that all Israel may be saved,' as he subjoins in the following verse:—

26. "And thus all Israel shall be saved." This is the conclusion of the fourth argument, whereby the apostle proves Israel's recal, of which the assumption has been established in the verse immediately preceding; and it is likewise the antecedent of the enthymeme, which went before in the 1st ver. of chap. x., as was there remarked: this conclusion is therefore the sum of the whole discussion concerning the gathering again of the Israelites, which has been pursued from the beginning of the tenth chapter up to this place.—'Therefore, all Israel shall be recalled from their present hardening, and gathered again to the God of their salvation.' Instead, however, of this 'recal and gathering again,' which was to be concluded, is put 'salvation,' the effect of effectual recalling and gathering again, and the apostle says "And thus all Israel shall be saved;" that is, 'having been recalled through the gospel to the God of their salvation, and the spirit of hardening having been removed, Israel, yielding to the gospel call, shall be brought in with the Gentiles, and become partakers of the salvation of God. "All Israel." In this conclusion, "all Israel," is opposed to 'a part of Israel;' but the question is—of which Israel? of that to which the present discussion seems to refer (see above, chap. ii. 28); or of that which is Israel in spirit, and composed both of Jewish and Gentile believers? We answer, that it may be understood of either. If we understand it of the former, then the 'part of Israel' is the handful of the saved during the time of hardening, which has been reserved for God among Israel according to the flesh, and separated unto himself from the multitude of those that perish,' according to the election of his grace; while those that perish claim to themselves, on account of their multi-

tude, the name of 'the Israelitish nation,' and of 'all the people.' Thus, in the days of Elijah, the seven thousand Israelites, who had not bowed the knee to Baal, when the great majority and body of the people of Jehovah, during the reign and apostacy of Ahab, had apostatized from Jehovah, killed his prophets, and dug down his altars, were a part of Israel (see above, ver. 4); so, in the time of Paul, was that very small number of Jews who embraced Jesus Christ, while the great majority were apostatizing and denying him, and who are therefore called by the apostle in vv. 1 and 2 of this chap. 'the people of God, whom God has not cast away:' this very small number of Jews, I say, is called a 'part of Israel;' to which part if we oppose what the apostle here says, "all Israel shall be saved," then "all Israel" will be 'the great majority of the nation, or the body of the ancient people of God, descendants of Israel.' The meaning will thus be, 'that before the gospel ministration is ended, and previous to the second coming of Christ, not only shall the preaching of the gospel prove effectual for the bringing in of the Gentiles to Christ, but after the Gentiles shall have been brought in, the same preaching shall be effectual, through the gospel call, for the bringing in of the Israelites; and thus, as some, reserved for God through the election of grace, owned Christ as Lord in the days of Paul, so, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have been brought in, the great majority of the Israelitish people are to be called, through the gospel, to the God of their salvation, and shall profess and own Jesus Christ, whom formerly, that is, during the time of hardening, they denied, and that the prediction of a blessed seed, made to Abraham their father, has been fulfilled.' This interpretation of the passage is most pertinent to the scope of the present discussion; but because that recal of the Israelites is not yet witnessed in respect to the majority, (κατὰ πλῆθος,) most interpreters explain the passage differently, and understand what the apostle here says—"all Israel shall be saved," of Israel in spirit, and also of all Israelites according to the flesh, who at any time have believed, whether in times of apostacy, as were those of Ahab and Paul, or

of open profession, as that of David, or of reformation, as those of Hezekiah and Josiah. In this way the meaning will be—'that the Gentiles having been added, through the gospel, to the people of God, that is, to the Israelites, who are Israelites in spirit, as well as according to the flesh, "all Israel," viz., Israel in spirit, consisting of the elect from among Jews and Gentiles, "shall be saved" at the second coming of Christ.' This, therefore, is the foundation of the mystery, now under the gospel, of the recal of the Jews, that as it was unknown to the Jews, who were chiefly under the law, in what manner the Gentiles were to be called, so it is unknown to the Gentiles, under the gospel, in what manner the Israelites are to be recalled; whether the body of the people are to be recalled to faith during the ministration of the gospel, or the elect only to salvation, along with the Gentiles, at the second coming of Christ. Understood in the latter way, the passage, instead of being the conclusion of the foregoing syllogism, will rather be an inference deduced from it, in this manner:—"And thus," that is, 'the Gentiles having been brought in, and recalled to the Jews, *i. e.*, added to those who have been reserved according to election, all Israel in spirit, gathered out of Israelites and Gentiles, shall be saved.' But the former exposition is the more probable of the two, as being both more agreeable to the design of the apostle, and better established by the Scripture authorities which are subjoined.

"According as it is written." This conclusion of the fourth argument concerning the recal of the Israelites to salvation, inasmuch as it is the conclusion of a lengthened discussion, which has been continued from the beginning of chap. x. up to this place, the apostle confirms by scripture authorities, to teach us 'that, in the matter of religion, all other arguments that may be adduced go for nothing, unless both the arguments themselves, and the conclusion deduced from them, be based on the written word of God;' so that in theology 'God himself has said' (αὐτὸς ἔφη) holds the place of a first principle, which does not admit of being demonstrated: from this he would also have us learn 'that the word on which faith ought to rely, and which is unhesitatingly to

be regarded as the word of God, is that which has been committed to writing by God's amanuenses, the prophets and apostles alone;' and, therefore, in adducing the word of God to establish what he is teaching, he says,—"According as it is *written*." The testimony of scripture brought forward is one, but composed of two passages from Isaiah; for it is a usual thing with this apostle to make a single testimony of different passages from the prophets put together into one: thus, in the 8th verse of this chapter he has adduced one testimony, consisting of two passages from Isaiah, to prove the hardening of Israel; and so here he has framed one testimony out of two passages from Isaiah, to establish the recal of the same Israel to the God of their salvation. The one passage is from Isaiah lix. 20, 21, "the deliverer shall come out of Zion, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob;

27. And this covenant [shall be] to them from me;" the second is from Isaiah xxvii. 9.—"When I shall have taken away their sins;" from both of which passages the apostle establishes, by the authority of the prophet, the two following things: First, he establishes, 'that Christ coming in the flesh is to take away iniquity, not only from the Gentiles, but especially from Israel, so that he is to be acknowledged by that people as their avenger and redeemer:' and as this did not take place immediately on the coming of Christ and the first publication of the gospel, on account of the hardening of that people, which he has before taught has happened to Israel for the sake of the bringing in of the Gentiles, the apostle infers 'that this benefit will afterwards be conferred by Christ upon the Israelites, and that they, although now hardened, are yet hereafter to be recalled to Christ, for the remission of their sins in him; which recal will at length take place after the Gentiles shall have been brought in, for the bringing in of whom hardening has happened to Israel.' The second thing which the apostle deduces from these passages is this, 'that the covenant of God in Christ is to be with Israel after that previous benefit shall have been bestowed, and God in Christ shall have

taken away their sins, and above all, the sin of hardening and rejection of Christ.' The meaning of both passages, therefore, is this, 'Although now that Israel is hardened, the apostle might say, as he says in Acts xiii. 46,—"We turn to the Gentiles," and preach Christ unto them for the remission of sins, yet it will come to pass at length, namely, when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have been brought in, that all Israel shall receive Christ, so that they also shall become partakers, as the Gentiles have become, of the remission of sins in Christ; and when this shall have taken place, the covenant of God in Christ shall then be with Israel, as it now is with the Gentiles. That this is the meaning appears to be proved by the most explicit language of the apostle in 2 Cor. iii. 15, 16, where, speaking of Israel in his own age, he says,—"even until this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart; but when they shall have turned to the Lord, the vail shall be taken away;" in which words he seems to assert these two things:—(1st,) 'that the Israelites were hardened, and that the vail was upon their hearts at the time when he was preaching, to wit, that an opportunity might thus be afforded for the bringing in of the Gentiles;' (2dly,) 'that the Israelites would afterwards at length turn to the Lord, at which time their hardening should cease, and the vail be taken away.'

28. "(Therefore)," &c. This is a corollary, subjoined to the last conclusion concerning the future recal of Israel to the God of their salvation, in order that the apostle may thereby check the triumphing of the Gentiles over the Israelites, against which he has spoken at great length proleptically in the course of the foregoing discussion, viz. in the 17th and following verses: as, therefore, in the two preceding verses, the conclusion was 'that all Israel are to be recalled to the God of their salvation;' so in this verse, the apostle would conclude 'that the Gentiles ought not to glory against Israel, not even during the present time of hardening itself.' The corollary consists of two parts. "As regards the gospel, they are enemies for your sakes." In this, which is

the first part, he admits, indeed, that the Israelites are enemies to God, but qualifies and softens the assertion, first, by saying—'that they are enemies to the God of their salvation, not *simpliciter*,* and at heart, but *secundum quid*,† and as regards the gospel;' secondly, by the end, viz.—'that they are enemies to God for the sake of the Gentiles themselves,' that is, 'that the gospel of the kingdom may be communicated to the Gentiles;' and in this end, especially, lies the force of the argument, thus:—

'The Israelites are not enemies to God, except as regards the gospel, and for your sakes, that the gospel may be preached to you:

'Therefore, do not you Gentiles triumph over the Israelites, although they are enemies to God.'

This first part of the corollary is deduced partly from the foregoing proleptical discussion in verse 11, where it is said—'that, through the fall of Israel, salvation has come to the Gentiles;' partly from the fourth argument, and verse 25, where it is said—'that hardening has happened to Israel only in part, and until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in;' the apostle, therefore, thus reasons:—

'Hardening has happened to Israel, that, through Israel's fall, salvation might come to the Gentiles; and only in part, and until the fulness of the Gentiles should come in:

'Therefore, the Israelites are enemies only for the sake of you Gentiles, as it regards the Gospel.'

"But as regards election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes." This is the second part of the corollary, which is deduced from the third argument, and preceding 16th verse:—

'The root of Israel is holy:

'Therefore, Israel themselves are holy and beloved by God;' whence the apostle proceeds by a prosyllogism, thus:—

'We must not triumph over God's beloved;

'The Israelites are still holy and beloved by God:

'Therefore the Gentiles ought not to triumph over the Israelites.'

* Simply; absolutely. † According to *something*; relatively.

This love, moreover, wherewith the Israelites are beloved by God, is explained by its cause, which is,—'the gratuitous election of God;' "Jehovah, thy God, hath chosen thee unto himself above all the nations which are in the whole earth." (Deut. vii. 6;) and this election is the cause of the love, as it is said in the same place, (verses 7 and 8.) The election itself is then explained by its subject, which was—'the fathers of the Israelites:'

'God choose the fathers of the Israelites, and the Israelites themselves in their fathers:

'Therefore the Israelites are beloved in their fathers because of election.'

29. "For the gifts and calling of God are such," &c. He goes on to prove the consequence of the foregoing enthymeme, viz.—'that the love of God still continues to remain to the Israelitish nation, inasmuch as God chose their fathers, and themselves in their fathers.' The argument is taken from the unchangeableness of the gifts of God—both those which God, through his Spirit, specially confers upon his own, and effectual calling, through which these gifts become known to themselves, thus:—

'God cannot repent of his own election, whereby he has chosen his own, nor of the love wherewith he loves his own, nor of that gift which he specially confers upon his own, nor of the effectual calling whereby he calls his own out of the world unto himself, and causes his gifts to become known to themselves;' or, to express the same thing in other words, 'election, love, effectual calling, are gifts so unchangeable, that they can never afterwards be taken away from those on whom they have once been conferred;

'But God chose the Israelites in their fathers, loved, and effectually called them to be a people unto himself: 'Therefore the election, love, effectual calling, and other gifts of that kind bestowed by God on the Israelitish nation, continued to remain with God'—or, which is the same thing, 'the Israelites still continue beloved, because of their election in the fathers.'

From this, therefore, two things fall to be observed by us. The

first thing is, that the mind of the apostle is this, 'that the Israelitish nation, from the time that they were once elected in their fathers, beloved and effectually called to God, have never since been, nor ever shall be rejected by God, but always continue the people of God among the rest of the elect, as they were in the days of Elijah and Paul, and shall be in the days of their future recal:' and this is what the apostle expressly asserts in verse 2 of this chap. "God hath not cast away his people whom he foreknew." The second thing which falls to be observed by us here, is that although the hardened and apostates in the Israelitish nation often formed the great majority of that people, as they continue from the days of Paul to the present day; yet these, according to the mind of the apostle, are never to be reckoned the Israelitish nation, but, as he has spoken above, dried branches from the trunk of Israel, which have been broken off through their own unbelief.

30. The next two verses contain the fifth argument, whereby the apostle proves that the Jews are to be recalled to the God of their salvation. The argument is taken from the end of Israel's apostacy or revolt—'the Israelites have not obeyed God, but have revolted, for this end, that they themselves might afterwards obtain mercy;' from which end the apostle thus reasons:

'Whosoever are disobedient for this end, that they may afterwards obtain mercy, shall obtain it'—this, which is the proposition, is omitted, as being obvious and self-evident; the assumption is illustrated by a comparison.—

'As the Gentiles, who were formerly unyielding and disobedient to God, have since obtained mercy; so the Israelites, who are now unyielding and disobedient to the gospel, shall again obtain mercy to the obedience of the gospel, and participation of the salvation which is in Jesus Christ:

'Therefore the Israelites, who have become disobedient, shall obtain mercy, and are to be recalled to the God of their salvation.'

"For, as you also formerly did not obey God."* This is the protasis or first part of the comparison; which contains two things:

(1.) 'The revolt of the Gentiles'—the Gentiles did not obey God;" (2.) 'The issue of their revolt.' As regards the former, namely, 'the apostacy of the Gentiles,' it is illustrated by the adjunct of the time—'formerly, that is, 'from the building of the tower of Babel even to the incarnation (ἐνσάρκωσιν) of the Son of God.' "But now have obtained mercy." This is the second thing included in the protasis, viz. 'the issue of the Gentiles' apostacy'—'the Gentiles, after apostacy for a definite time, have obtained mercy.' "Through their disobedience." The apostle illustrates 'the mercy of the Gentiles' and the issue of their apostacy, by the adjunct of its occasion; which was—'the disobedience of the Jews, whereby, rejecting the gospel, they were deserted by God, and the offers of grace through the gospel transferred to the Gentiles.'

31. "To have these also now," &c.: this is the apodosis, or second part of the comparison and the assumption of the syllogism; which, in like manner, contains two things. The first thing is—'the apostacy of Israel'—"they" viz. 'the Israelites,' "do not obey God;" which is in like manner illustrated by the adjunct of the time "now," that is 'now that Christ has come, and under the revelation of the gospel, even to the bringing in of the fulness of the Gentiles.' "That through your mercy they also may obtain mercy." This is the second thing contained in the apodosis, namely, 'the end or issue of the apostacy of the Jews,' viz.—'the obtaining of mercy;' which is illustrated by the adjunct of its occasion—'the Israelites, having been recalled, shall obtain mercy through the mercy of the Gentiles themselves.' By the "mercy of the Gentiles," moreover, I understand, 'that which, now that the gospel has come, they have obtained through occasion of the hardening of the Israelites,' that is 'the grace which they have received to believe the gospel when preached, and to embrace Jesus Christ offered in that preaching for righteousness and life;' of which grace we see an instance at Antioch (Acts xiii. 48, 49), where, while the Jews are contradicting and fuming with indignation, the Gentiles hear, and, having heard, rejoice, and for joy ex-

tol the word of God, so that from them this same grace sounds forth and is published through the whole region, to be yet believed in among the Gentiles. Through this grace, or mercy of God bestowed upon the Gentiles, the apostle says, that the Jews shall obtain mercy, when the time of their recal and obtaining mercy shall have come: because God, through this mercy, will provoke the Jews, in their own time, to emulation, that is, to embrace the same mercy with the Gentiles, which is said, in v. 11 of this chap. to be the end of the mercy conferred upon the Gentiles.

32. "For God hath shut up," &c. This is the sixth and last argument whereby the apostle proves the recal of the Israelites, from the end of God in shutting up under disobedience, which is —'that he may shew mercy to the disobedient themselves:' whence the apostle thus reasons:—

'Those whom God shuts up under disobedience, in order that he may shew mercy to them, are to obtain mercy, and to be recalled to the God of their salvation;

'But God has shut up all'—that is, 'not only the Gentiles, in times past, but now also the Jews'—'in unbelief, that he may shew mercy to all,' that is, 'not only to the Gentiles, but also to the Jews themselves:

'Therefore, as the Gentiles have obtained mercy, and have been brought in through the gospel, so are the Israelites to obtain mercy, and to be recalled to the God of their salvation.'

The assumption alone is given in the text, the rest being obvious. This "shutting up," moreover, whereby God shuts up all under disobedience, is—'the effectual operation of God according to his own eternal decree, whereby, through his own wisdom and knowledge, he effects that all, first the Gentiles, and then the Jews, have become disobedient, not only in Adam, through his fall, but also since, in such a way, that God himself should always continue most just, and be justice itself, so as to be in no degree the author of the disobedience or sin, either of the Gentiles or of the Jews, but whereby he makes the disobedience of both the medium of

displaying his own mercy in Jesus Christ; which mercy, 'whosoever shall despise, shall perish eternally to the glory of his justice in judgment, as those who have been fore-ordained to that despisal.' This same mercy and justice the apostle has set before us for our contemplation, when, in the 22d verse preceding, he admonishes every one, saying,—"Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God;" just as also, in the following verse, he admires the wisdom, knowledge, and justice of God, as shining forth in his goodness and in his severity, apart.

33. Hence, to the end of the chapter, we have an epiphonematical* conclusion of the discussion which had been prosecuted from the commencement of chapter ix. up to this place, concerning the revolt of the Israelites, the calling of the Gentiles, and the recal of Israel when once the fulness of the Gentiles has been brought in. The epiphonema consists of two parts. The first part, which is given in this 33d verse, contains an assertion of the wisdom of God, the knowledge of God, and the justice of God in all his administration; the assertion being—'that God himself is wisdom itself, knowledge itself, and justice itself.' This assertion, moreover, is embellished by a twofold exclamation, wherein the apostle admires the wisdom, knowledge, and justice that are in God. "O the profound riches, both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!" This is the first exclamation, in which he both magnifies and admires, as well the wisdom as the knowledge of God. He magnifies them, moreover, in two ways. First, absolutely, when he puts—"the riches of the wisdom," and "the riches of the knowlege" for—'the wisdom,' and 'the knowledge' "of God;" by which magnifying he would intimate—'that God himself is rich in wisdom, also that the knowledge of God is the riches of knowledge, and, consequently, that God is rich in knowledge;' for so the apostle is elsewhere wont to express the essential knowledge of God; as in Col. ii. 3, where he says, that in Christ "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," just as "in him

* A sentence added to finish with; a moral.

dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," as it is said in the 9th verse of the same chapter. Again he magnifies this knowledge and wisdom of God comparatively, when he says—that the riches of his wisdom, and the riches of his knowledge are "profound," and as it were 'an abyss of wisdom and knowledge, unsearchable alike to angels and to men, and, consequently, to every creature:' for God knows both what is in angels and what is in men, and needs not that any one should tell him (John ii. 25); but into his boundless wisdom and knowledge neither man nor angel can penetrate. Finally, he admires them by exclaiming—"*Oh!* the profound riches," &c. "How inscrutable are his judgments, and unsearchable his ways!" By the "judgments" of God I understand 'the counsels of the divine mind,' or the primary effects of his wisdom and knowledge, especially, however, as adapted to shut up all under disobedience, in order that God may shew mercy to all: by the "ways" of God again, I understand 'the executions of the divine mind,' or the secondary effects of his wisdom and knowledge, especially in shutting up all under disobedience, in order that God may shew mercy to all. This, therefore, is the second exclamation, wherein the apostle, with devout admiration, asserts—'that both the counsels of God, and the execution of his counsels, whether in shutting up under disobedience, or in shewing mercy, are inscrutable to man in such a way that although man cannot see the reason of them they are nevertheless always most just and most wise.'

34. "For who hath known the mind of the Lord," &c. He proves the first part of the assertion, viz.—'that the riches, both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God, are profound beyond every creature,' by the testimony of scripture, from Isaiah, xl. 13, 14. The apostle cites the prophet, and interrogatively plies every creature with the negation of penetrating into the mind of God; for when he says—"for who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" he wishes to extort from all, whether angels or men, the confession that

there is none. The apostle, therefore, thus reasons out of the prophet:—

'No one, whether angel or man, has ever penetrated into the knowledge of the mind of God, or been able to act as his counsellor in the conduct of his affairs:

'Therefore, the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God are worthy of admiration.'

35. "Or who hath previously given to him, and it shall be rendered to him again?" He next proves what he has above said in the second part of the exclamation in verse 33, viz.—'that God is most just, and consequently the rule of justice itself, both in all his counsels, and in the execution of them all, although his counsels are inscrutable, and his ways unsearchable.' The argument is drawn from the definition of justice; for justice consists in rendering again what has previously been given; since it is the part of justice to render justly, or as equity demands, to the giver. Of this justice, as there are two kinds—*distributive* justice, and *commutative* justice, so what we have said is common to both; for distributive justice bestows nothing on him who deserves nothing, but dispenses to him who has previously deserved reward or punishment, as the case may demand; while commutative justice demands that, in a voluntary and lawful contract, a just price be given for a thing received in exchange. He, therefore, on whom nothing has been previously bestowed, as a most free agent, cannot be accused of injustice, either in his counsels, or in his ways and actions towards others. The apostle, accordingly, thus reasons—

'He to whom no one, either angel or man, has previously given any thing, so that it may be rendered again to the giver, cannot be unjust, either in his counsels, or in the execution of them, but is most just;

'But nothing has been, nor is it possible that anything could have been previously given to God, by any one, either angel or man, so that it might be rendered again to him by God:

'Therefore, God is unjust to no one, either angel or man, either in his counsels, or in the execution of his counsels.'

The assumption—which deprives every creature who is but a creature, of all merit, and vindicates God from all injustice, both in his decrees, whether to life or to death, and in the execution of what he has eternally decreed—is given in the text, and is the very thing which the same apostle has before replied in the course of this identical discussion, (chap. ix. vv. 20, 21)—"Nay, but O man! who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing fashioned say to him that fashioned it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, out of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?"—in which words he vindicates the justice of God, whatever may be the complaints of sinners against it, and upon the same ground, viz., that he is a most free agent, and a debtor to none.

36. In this verse he proves the foregoing assumption, viz.—'that no one has previously given to God that it may be rendered to him again.' The argument is taken from two effects of God, and the end of both jointly: the first effect is that of—'creation,' for all things are "from him," effecting; the second is that of—'preservation,' for all things are "through him," as the God of providence, and the administrator of all; the end of both is—'his own glory,' which is expressed by the words—"to him," (εἰς αὐτὸν,) that is,—'for the sake of him and of his glory.' "To him be glory." This is the second part of the epiphonema, as we have observed on verse 33; and contains a celebration of the divine praises, which is here made in two parts. The first part contains a proclamation, whereby the apostle, in the name of the whole Church, ascribes glory to his God. "To him be glory for ever." He amplifies the glory which he has ascribed to God by its adjunct, namely—'that it shall both endure, and ought to be celebrated by the Church for ever.' "Amen!" This is the second part of the celebration of the divine glory, containing an acknow-

ledgment, whereby the apostle, in the name of every member of the Church, signifies his approbation of the glory which he has proclaimed, as most justly ascribed, and to be ascribed for ever, to his God.

CHAPTER XII.

Thus far we have had the first part of this isagoge to the truth in Christ,* and compendium of the Christian religion, in the commendation of the gospel and proof of the proposition—'that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' In this proof the apostle has discussed two things: first—'that righteousness whereby man is justified before God;' and secondly—'the life which follows thereupon.' And he has reasoned concerning each in two ways, both constructively and destructively: concerning righteousness—'that it is through the faith of the gospel,' he has reasoned from the 18th verse of chap. i. to the 20th verse of chap. v.; from which place up to the commencement of the 8th chapter he has replied to all objections whatever, drawn from the law, which could be adduced against the righteousness of faith: in chap. viii. again, he has reasoned concerning the full persuasion of life, and the certainty of escaping condemnation, which in its beginning at least, is possessed by all who are justified through the faith of the gospel; and has replied to the objections against that way of life, taken from the people of the law, or Israel, according to the flesh, from the commencement of chap. ix. up to this place, or the commencement of the 12th chap. Now follows in order, the second part of this isagoge, which wholly consists in an exhortation to a life worthy of the gospel, or such as befits him who is righteous, and looks for life from the righteousness of faith, that is, God's righteousness in Jesus Christ.

* Τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ ἀλήθειαν.

1. "I exhort you, therefore," &c. This exhortation is deduced from his previous teaching, as a conclusion from its antecedent, or an effect from its cause, which the apostle indicates in the commencement of the chapter, by the illative particle (οὖν) "therefore," to teach us:—'that a conversation conformed to this world, and a sincere profession of the gospel, are inconsistent and incompatible with each other, so that whosoever would live a new life here, in accordance with a sincere profession of the gospel, so as thence to hope for eternal life, must withdraw himself from the conversation of this world; and, on the contrary, that whoever has not withdrawn himself from the conversation of this world, does not yet sincerely hope for eternal life, nor has yet begun to be a new man, and to live upon this earth that life of God which is called 'the new life,' namely, that of an evangelical profession; and this is what the apostle elsewhere expressly asserts, Col. iii. vv. 1, 2, 3, where he connects the desire, and consequently the hope of those things which are laid up for us in that everlasting life, with the first resurrection, subjoining—"for ye are dead," and afterwards, ver. 5—"mortify, therefore," &c.; wherefore, no man can live a life worthy of the gospel, unless he be mortified to the world.

This second part of the isagoge consists in a proposition, contained in the two first vv. of this 12th chap.; and an exposition of the proposition, from the 3d ver. of chap. xii. to the 15th ver. of chap. xv. The apostle proposes this exhortation of his to a life worthy of the gospel, in these first two vv., in two ways: first, figuratively, by an allegory borrowed from the law, in ver. 1; then in plain terms, without a figure, in ver. 2. The allegorical proposition is this:—"present your bodies a sacrifice to God;" which he first of all persuades to by arguments, and amplifies. The arguments which he employs are three in number. Of these, the first is taken from the instrumental efficient cause, indicated by the words already quoted—"I (the apostle Paul) exhort you, to present your bodies a sacrifice to God:" for evangelical exhortation, by the heralds of God, is the instrument of new obedience,

whereby God ordinarily effects that his people should present their bodies a sacrifice unto him; and this exhortation, whenever it is accompanied with apostolical authority, is of no little weight to persuade to obedience. Paul, therefore, thus argues here:—

'I, an apostle of Christ Jesus, exhort you, by my authority as an apostle, to present your bodies a sacrifice to God:

'Therefore, do you present your bodies to God as a sacrifice.'

"Brethren." The second argument of exhortation is drawn from a participation in common grace, which the apostle indicates by the common brotherhood subsisting betwixt himself and them; for whoever are brethren in Christ, are at the same time, also the sons of God in Christ, "and if sons, also heirs, joint-heirs with Christ," and partakers in him of common grace: in styling them—"brethren," therefore, that is—'partakers, through Christ Jesus, of the same grace with himself,' he wishes to shew, that that communion or brotherhood in common grace, should persuade them to obedience, and should induce them to present their bodies, as he himself had presented his, a sacrifice to God. "By the compassions of God." "Compassions" (οἰκτιρμοὶ) denote two things: first—'the effects of mercy;' that is, 'the inward affections proceeding from mercy;' and secondly—'the very tender affections of most loving mothers.' By "the compassions of God," therefore, in this place, the apostle means—'the very tender affections of God, as of a most loving father, to speak anthropopathically, towards us, who have been reconciled to him in Christ, and all proceeding from the divine mercy:' for so the Psalmist defines the compassions of God, in Psalm ciii. 13, when he says, that—"like as a father pitieth his children, so Jehovah pitieth them that fear him." This, therefore, is the third argument for the allegorical proposition, whereby he persuades them to present their bodies as a sacrifice to God. The argument is taken from the end, thus:—'present your bodies as a sacrifice to God, by the compassions of God,' that is, 'that it may be made manifest both to your own consciences, and to others in the Church, who are the children of God's mercy, that you are partakers of these compassions;' or it may be said that the argu-

ment contained in these words is drawn from the efficient cause, in this way:—

'Since God is merciful to you in the communication of the gospel, and of his grace in his Son,' as has before been proved, and has thus shewn that he entertains towards you the affection of a father, and that of the tenderest kind (Isaiah xlix. 14, 15):

'Do you therefore, as a thanksgiving for so great a kindness—even the mercies of the children of God, communicated to you in Jesus Christ—present yourselves as a sacrifice to God.'

From this observe two things: Notice first—that, if any one wishes to shew that he is a vessel of mercy, and a partaker of the compassions of God, he should offer himself to God as a sacrifice, living, holy and acceptable. The second thing to be noticed is—that if any one be a partaker of the compassions of God, he cannot but offer himself as a sacrifice to God; for such is the power of the compassions of God communicated to any one, that they cause him, to whom they have been communicated, to offer himself to God as a sacrifice, living, holy and acceptable.

"That ye present your bodies."

Thus far the three arguments in support of the proposition: next comes the proposition itself, enunciated figuratively, as has been said—"present your bodies as a sacrifice unto God."

The form of expression is allegorical, and borrowed from the law: we, or our bodies, are compared to the bulls, oxen, lambs, kids, and other animals, which were offered to God under the law; our new obedience, which is the effect of faith and sanctification, is compared to the consecration of the animals to be slain, whereby, before being slain, they were presented to Jehovah at the altar; and so the acceptableness, in Jesus Christ, of our imperfect obedience, is compared to the acceptableness of these sacrifices: for as many things which are said in the law about the sacrifices to be offered to God were shadows of the Son of God, who was offered on the altar of the cross for our transgressions that he might reconcile us to God; so the ancient sacrifice of animals was a type of the sa-

crifice afterwards to be offered to God, among all nations by new obedience and giving of thanks, (Mal. i. 11.) By "bodies," accordingly, in this proposition, we are to understand by synecdoche—'the whole man, composed of body and soul:' for as Christ redeems, and reconciles to the Father the whole man, and sanctifies the whole man by his Spirit, (1 Thes. v. 23); so man should present, not only his body, but his entire person as a sacrifice to God, by blameless living. The apostle, therefore, here puts one constituent of man for the entire man, a part for the whole; and he thus speaks, because, although it is from the heart that what either defiles a man, or proves him pure, proceeds, according as it is written—"out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and elsewhere—that thefts, murders, fornications, and whatever defiles a man, "proceed from the heart;" yet it is in the actions of the body especially, as being openly subjugated to the bodily eyes, that God is either glorified, or his name exposed to reproach. "Living," this is the third part of the verse, wherein he proceeds to amplify the proposition of the exhortation thus defended by its arguments; and this he does in two ways: first, by the adjuncts of the qualities of the sacrifice to be offered; and, secondly, by a definition of this offering, whereby we present our bodies a sacrifice to God. The adjuncts of the qualities of the sacrifice are three: first, the sacrifice which we offer to God must be—"living;" then—"holy;" thirdly—"acceptable." By the first of these qualities this sacrifice of Christians is distinguished from that of animals under the law: for the beasts which were offered were slain, and consequently were *dead* sacrifices; but the apostle exhorts us so to offer ourselves to God, that we may be alive when offered.

The same quality distinguishes the eucharistic sacrifice of our new obedience, from the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ: for he offered himself to God as a ransom,* and as the price of our redemption by death; but, as regards us, the apostle bids us offer ourselves as a living sacrifice to God. Moreover, by the "life"

* Εἰς λύτρον.

here alluded to, I understand—'that new life, which is ours through the regeneration of the Spirit,' and which, in Gal. ii. 20, is called—'the life of God:' the apostle, therefore, bids us take heed to ourselves, and seek, when we offer ourselves to God, that we may perceive the life of God begun and advancing within us. "Holy." By the second quality, the sacrifice of Christians is distinguished from the sacrifices of the Gentiles, among whom both religion, and life with men, which are the two branches of the new obedience or offering here enjoined, were most full of defilement, from which the apostle bids Christians take heed that their sacrifice be "holy" or separated; as he also charges at length, in Eph. iv., ver. 17 to 25: for the 'sanctification,' either of a person or thing, is 'the separation of that person or thing from the defilement of a perishing world.' This sanctification or separation of the sacrifice from defilement, was shadowed forth by the sacrifice under the law, which, by the command of God, behoved to be without spot or imperfection, (Deut. xv. 21;) also, by the cleanness of those who offered, and those who brought the sacrifice: for it was unlawful for any one to present himself under the law, unless he was pure according to the purification which the law required; [as we learn from] Numb. ix. 6, where those who had been defiled by the dead body of a man are kept back from celebrating the passover of Jehovah on the fourteenth day of the first month, and are put off to the fourteenth day of the second month, that, having been first made clean, they might then present themselves to Jehovah. "Acceptable unto God." This is the third quality, whereby the sacrifice of those who are Christians in truth is distinguished from the sacrifice, that is, from the service and life of all who are not in Christ Jesus, whether they be idolaters, without the pale of the visible Church, or heretics, or utter hypocrites, within its bosom. These are altogether an abomination and abhorrence to God, both as regards themselves and their religion and life—"I have no delight in you, saith Jehovah of hosts, and I accept not an offering at your hand," (Mal. i. 10;) 'whosoever are not in Christ;' and that because both the offerers, and whatever is offered by them, are in-

pure: [for so we learn from] Tit. i. 15, where, when the apostle has said, that—"to the defiled (*μεμιασμένοις*) there is nothing pure," but that, "both their mind and conscience are defiled," he further defines those whom he denominates "defiled," as "unbelievers," * *i.e.*, 'all who are not engrafted into Christ Jesus through genuine faith;' therefore, it is because those who are not engrafted into Christ Jesus, as well as whatsoever is offered by them are defiled, that neither they themselves, nor the gift which they offer, are accepted, as the prophet speaks. Although, therefore, that acceptableness, or the third quality of the Christian sacrifice, whereby it becomes "acceptable to God," follows the two preceding, whereby the apostle commands that it be "living" and "holy;" yet—inasmuch as neither our new life, nor our begun sanctification can stand before God, on account of the imperfection of both, unless covered by Jesus Christ and his perfection—that acceptableness is, properly speaking, the effect, neither of the life, nor of the holiness which has been begun within us, but of Christ apprehended by us through faith; therefore, it is not because this sacrifice of Christians, namely, life and begun sanctification, is living and holy, that it is acceptable unto God; but it is because whoever is endued with new life and true holiness is in Christ, that both the life and holiness, and the gift itself, are acceptable.

"Which is your reasonable service." This is the second amplification of the sacrifice to be offered by Christians, taken from a definition of that sacrifice: if you ask—what is the sacrifice of the people of God under the gospel, or of Christians? it is—'the reasonable service of God's people, or of Christians.' In this definition, "your service," or 'the service of the people of God,' is the common genus, denoting—'the duty to God to be performed by God's people, according to both tables of the law, from the very beginning of the world, on to its very end:' and in calling that service (*λατρείαν*) "the reasonable" (*τὴν λογικὴν*), he lays down the difference, whereby the service of the people of God, with which they serve him now under the gospel, is distinguished from that

* Ἀπίστους.

with which they served him under the law; the one being external and confined to stated places, times, and carnal ceremonies, but the other internal, in spirit and in truth. This difference, our Lord points out (John iv. 20, 21, 22, 23,) in his reasoning with the Samaritan woman, when she proposes to him a question of controversy betwixt the Samaritans and the Jews, along with the arguments on either side. The Samaritans said that God ought to be served on Mount Gerizzim, the Jews, at Jerusalem; this was the controversy: the argument of the former was—'that there their fathers served God;' of the latter—'that according to the law, it was necessary so to worship him,' (Deut. xii. 16, compared with 2 Sam. xxiv. 18, in the former of which passages, God's people are commanded to serve him in that place which Jehovah should choose for himself out of all the tribes of Israel; and in the latter, he makes choice of the thrashing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, at Jerusalem). Our Lord replying to this proposition of the woman, and justifying the Jews thus far in that controversy, shews that the distinction betwixt the divine service from that time forward, and the service of former times, would be this, namely—'that hitherto it was necessary that God should be served at Jerusalem, as the Jews said; but that thereafter a time should come, yea, then was,'—by which he means 'under the gospel'—'in which the service of God should not be restricted either to the Samaritan mountain, or to Jerusalem, but when those who served God should serve him in spirit and in truth, wherever they pleased.' The apostle, therefore, here calls this service of God in spirit and in truth, without any restriction of place—"the reasonable service;" the whole of which he says is included in the offering whereby every Christian offers himself as a sacrifice to Jehovah.

2. "And do not conform yourselves to this age." This is the second branch of the proposition, illustrated by a contrast, and by the end. "And do not conform yourselves to this age." This forms the first member of the contrast, wherein he prohibits his

brethren, that is, all who were sharers and partakers with himself in the righteousness of faith and life through Jesus Christ, according to the gospel, from conformity (συσχηματισμόν) with the present age. By "the present age" (τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦτον) here, I understand, by metonymy of the adjunct for the subject—'the men of this age,' those, namely, whom the apostle, in 1 Cor. ii. 14, call "sensual," that is, 'having no endowments except those of nature corrupt as that now is, and entirely destitute of regeneration,* or the new birth through the Spirit:' for so Jude, in the 19th verse of his epistle, defines the "sensual" man (ψυχικὸν) as—'the man who has not the Spirit (of Christ,)' (πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντα. By the 'conformity' (συσχηματισμόν) again, which he here prohibits, I understand—'the endeavour to conform one's self in mind, will, and the external character also of one's words and actions to those who are sensual, and the children of corrupt nature merely.' In this, the first member of the contrast, therefore, he prohibits conformity, either in our words or actions—whether internal, that is, of the mind, or external, that is, of the body—with those who have not been born again; for an extended statement of which prohibition, along with the grounds of the same, see 2 Cor. vi. 14-15, 16. "But transform yourselves by the renewal of your mind." This is the second member of the contrast, whereby he recommends to his brethren to endeavour to grow in the Spirit, or the renewal of the mind, (which growth in the renewal of the mind, is the growth of the inward man;) and to manifest that growth by a life unlike to the life of this age, or "this world," as the apostle styles it, in Eph. ii. 2. The import of these words is thus the same as that of the charge which you read in Eph. iv. vv. 17, 23 and 24—"this I say, therefore, and charge you by the Lord, that ye walk no longer as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind;" "but be ye renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the new man; which, after God, is created unto righteousness and true holiness." By the term "mind, (τοῦ νοὸς,) therefore, I understand what the apostle means by the same word, when he

* Παλιγγενεσίας.

says above, chap. vii. ver. 25—"with the mind indeed, I myself serve the law of God;" and which he himself, in the 22d verse of the same chapter, has before interpreted [by the expression]—"as regards the inward man," (*κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*): "the mind," therefore, in this place, is—'the inward man,' which, in Eph. iv. 24, is called—"the new man," that is—'the whole and entire nature of man, in so far as he is renewed,' or, as the apostle speaks, —"is created (anew) unto righteousness and true holiness." By "renewal," (*ἀνακαινώσιν,*) again, I understand—not that whereby "the mind,"* or 'inward man' is renewed more and more day by day, but—'that whereby we ourselves are renewed at first, so that we become inward men and new creatures.' Or you may prefer to understand the term "mind" here in the same sense as that in which it is used in Eph. iv. 17, namely, as—'the old mind, and such as was that of the Gentiles without God;' and with this exposition, what is here added—"your"—seems to agree, because what the mind of the Gentiles and those who still remain in their natural state is now, that the mind of the renewed also was before they were renewed: therefore, when addressing the renewed, he says—"be ye transformed by the renewal of your mind," their "mind" may be well enough understood as—'that which they had before they were renewed;' and, taken in this sense, "the renewal" (*ἡ ἀνακαινώσις*) will be—not that of ourselves, as we are by nature into the "mind," or new man, but—'that of the old mind (*τοῦ νοὸς*) into the new mind.' Otherwise, this 'transformation' (*μετασχηματίσις*) will be—'the transfiguration of ourselves, whereby having been renewed in spirit, we so change—in thought, word, and deed—our formerly impure nature, that we become unlike to the world, and to what we ourselves were when in the world, being assimilated to God,' that is—"created (anew) after (the image of) God, in righteousness and true holiness." Three things are worthy of our notice here. The first is—that our renewal commences with the mind; whence it follows, that before our renewal, the mind itself, and the "wis-

* Ὁ νοῦς.

dom of the flesh," as the apostle calls it, c. viii. 7—just as the external actions of the body, the words, the affections of the heart, and the will itself—is enmity against God, and is wise after the old man, until it be renewed by the Spirit. Hence also the leading principle* of philosophers, whereby *purity* is ascribed to the mind of man, even in his natural state, *in the laying down of rules*, and also the *freedom of choice* of the Pelagians, Papists, and Semi-pelagians, are refuted; for if the mind itself must be renewed, there is in man neither a mental light which is free from sin, nor a voluntary choice which is not subject to sin. Notice, in the second place—that, while the apostle here bids us 'be transfigured and transformed,' or 'transfigure and transform ourselves,' yet he does not ascribe to *us* any power or ability, either to transform, or not to conform ourselves to this age, all power for our reformation being from the Holy Spirit; but the apostle exhorts us for two other reasons. He exhorts us, in the first place, that he may stir us up to a devout use of the means employed by the Holy Spirit. Thus, the Holy Spirit renews us through the ministry of the word, and, therefore, the apostle excites us, by these exhortations, to a frequent attendance upon the ministry of the word, in order that we may be renewed thereby. Secondly, he exhorts us, because the very exhortation itself, when it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit to work through the medium of exhortation, is "the power of God," or 'his powerful and effectual instrument' for renewing us. To these reasons we may also add a third, viz.—that the apostle exhorts us to renew ourselves, although that is the work of God alone, in Christ, through his Spirit, in order to stir us up to co-operate with God for the accomplishment of that work, according as it is written—'to him that asketh it shall be given, and to him that knocketh it shall at length be opened.' We should observe here, thirdly—that, according to the mind of the apostle, the Christian sacrifice, or that which, in the preceding verse, he has commanded us to offer "living" unto God, is made up of two parts; the one consisting in our reformation, or the renewal of our

* ἀγχίνοιαν.

mind, whereby we are conformed to God, and created again, after his image, in righteousness and true holiness; the other, in our transformation,* whereby we are made unlike to this age, and abstain from the ways of this world, and of that life which is according to 'the prince who has the power of the air,' as the apostle speaks, Eph. ii. 2.

"In order that ye may prove." We have here the end of each of the foregoing—both of our transfiguration, whereby we are made unlike to the world in our life, and of our renewal, (*ἀνακαινώσεως τοῦ νοὸς*,) whereby we are made new creatures; for we are both renewed and separated from the world for this end—'that we may prove what is the will of God.' By "the will of God," here, I understand—'his will as made known in the law concerning the new obedience of the renewed;' for so the apostle explains it in 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2, where, after reminding them of the commandments to new obedience which he had given them, he commands them to excel in the practice of these more and more every day, subjoining this reason—'that the will of God is their sanctification.' He then goes on to define "sanctification" by the matter of it, as—'abstinence from fornication, and every other pollution whereby the vessel of any of them—that is, either his body or heart—might be defiled;' for God dwells, through his Spirit, in both of these when regenerated, and each is to the regenerate, as it were, a vessel or shrine in which are deposited the treasures of spiritual grace, as the apostle himself speaks in 1 Cor. iv. 7. "To prove" (*τὸ δοκιμάζειν*) that will of God signifies three things. First, it is—'to understand' (*συνιέναι*) God's will, that is, both to know what it is, and to be able to distinguish it from every thing which is thrust upon us, under the pretext of its being God's will, when it is not that will, as the apostle interprets this word in Eph. v. 17. Secondly, "to prove" (*τὸ δοκιμάζειν*) the will of God is—'to approve it when understood;' and, in the third place, it is—'to choose, or embrace, it when approved;' for even the sensual man (*ὁ ψυχικὸς*) both understands the will of God, and will ap-

* Μεταμορφώσεως.

prove it when understood, but cannot embrace it, as the classical writer testifies concerning Medea—

"The best I see and can approve,
The worst I still pursue and love;"*

and, therefore, the apostle here subjoins this proving of the will of God as the proper end of the renewal of our mind, and of our separation from "the present evil world."

"That good and acceptable." He proceeds to illustrate "the will of God," as in the preceding verse he had illustrated the Christian sacrifice by a threefold epithet. First, [by saying] that it is "good," or 'wholly relates to good things,' so that whatever God wills to be done by the regenerate, is itself good. Secondly, [by saying] that it is "acceptable," that is—'that it, in like manner, relates to things acceptable to God,' so that whatever is done by the regenerate, according to the will of God, is acceptable to God in Jesus Christ, and is regarded as his service: hence, when the apostle exhorts the regenerate to duty, he ordinarily employs this argument—'that it is acceptable to God, (Phil. iv. 18; Col. iii. 20; 1 Tim. ii. 3.) Moreover, by these two things, viz.—'that it is good and acceptable to God,' the apostle distinguishes the will of God from all human precepts in the matter of religion, which those who obey, under the idea of serving God, neither do well, nor is what they do acceptable to God, as our Lord himself testifies, in Matt. xv. 9, when he says—'that all such service is vain.' "Perfect." This is the third epithet of the divine will, whereby it is distinguished from all science, art, or other tradition whatsoever of men concerning duty; for all these are imperfect; whereas, on the contrary, the divine will, made known by the law, is in every way complete, and shews to man in the most perfect manner, what he should either do, or not do; what is duty, and what a violation of duty.

3. Thus far we have had the proposition; now comes the explication of it, which wholly consists in various injunctions concerning duty, according to the sound doctrine of the gospel; for 'to

* "Video meliora proboque; deteriora sequor."—(*Ovid, Metam.* vii. 20, 21.)

present ourselves as a sacrifice to God,' is—'to be united to God, and transformed, by the renewal of our mind, from the form or fashion of this age;' and 'to prove what is that holy, good, and acceptable will of God,' is—'by the power of the regenerating Spirit "to walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," or "to live dutifully, and in a manner worthy of the gospel.' Accordingly, the explication of our 'living, holy, and acceptable sacrifice,' consists in—a setting forth of injunctions, whereby a life worthy of the gospel is prescribed; all of which are based upon the authority which he possesses through the grace of his apostleship. This exposition, therefore, is divided into two parts: the first containing, by way of a general foundation, the authority of him who enjoins; the second, the injunctions themselves of a life according to the gospel. The authority is, indeed, connected with the first injunction, and laid down as the foundation of his injunction to those whom he first enjoins, namely, the pastors in the evangelical Church of God; in such a way, however, that it is more than obvious that it is likewise the foundation of the other injunctions that follow, as appears from the 15th verse of chap. xv., where, at the close of the whole, he assigns as the reason of his boldness of speech,* and freedom in setting them forth—'the grace which was given him from God,'† *i. e.*, the grace of apostleship and of fidelity therein, which he has received from God, with a share of fruit through common faith.

"Therefore I command," (λέγω γὰρ). The term γὰρ is here the note of regular illation: for as the apostle, in the two preceding verses, has proposed to speak concerning a life worthy of the gospel; he now proceeds, in due order, to deliver injunctions regarding that life which is worthy of the gospel. Or the particle γὰρ may be taken as the note of the cause; as if the apostle had said—'I both propose and enjoin concerning a life worthy of the gospel, with authority, because grace for the apostleship has been given to me.' In whatever way the particle in question is taken, whether as illative or causal, the word λέγω, 'I say,' or 'command,' is a

* Παῤῥησίας. † Τὴν χάριν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ.

term of authority, and appropriate to the commander in an army, or a general among his soldiers;* and therefore Paul, having been appointed *as* it were a general in the Christian warfare, by his Lord, to enjoin upon others their duty, speaks with celestial authority, in accordance with the word of their common Lord. "I command every one that is among you, through the grace which has been given unto me." This is the reason whereby he shews that that authority of his to command every one among them, is not usurped but legitimate, as resting upon the grace of apostleship which had been committed to him by God; and whereby he precludes all evil speaking on the part of the envious, if any should be disposed to charge him with arrogance, while enjoining sobriety in wisdom, therefore thus reasons:—

'Grace for the apostleship has been given to me: Therefore I command those things which I now proceed to write and commend to you, by no usurped authority, but by the authority of the apostleship which has been committed to me.'

"To every one that is among you." The foundation of authority and grace having thus been laid, next come the injunctions; which are twofold: 1st, common; and 2d, special. I call those '*common* which are due according to common law and simply, *e.g.* to love one another. By the *special* again, I mean those which are due, not simply, but on account of some special respect which they have either to ourselves, or to our brethren; for example,—"to the pure all things," now under the gospel, "are pure," nor are we forbidden by the law to eat any thing we please, but "to him that esteemeth any thing impure, to him it is impure," and he is bound, in respect to his own estimation, not to eat thereof; also in respect to another, as a weak brother (namely), lest he cause him to offend; according to the law, therefore, we are free to eat; but if any one eat without faith, or with cause of offence, then to eat is evil. The apostle proceeds to treat of the injunctions of the former class, from this place to the commencement of chap. xiv. These are twofold, answering to the twofold duty which, according

* Compare Matt. viii. 9.

to the sound doctrine of the gospel, devolves on all who profess the gospel, and this twofold duty again arises out of the double relation which they sustain: for sincere professors of the gospel are, in the first place, members of the Church of God, and in this relation they are bound to those mutual duties which befit the members of a body of that kind; then they are members of the body politic, or of a Christian state, and in that relation also there are duties devolving upon them. Concerning the duties which we owe as members of the Church, the apostle enjoins in the remainder of this chap. (xii.); and concerning those to which we are bound as members of a Christian state, in the following chap. (xiii.) The former again, or those which devolve on professors of the gospel as members of the Church, are also twofold; for first, there are the duties of the presidents,* or those who watch over others in the Church; under which are also included the duties of those over whom they watch, answering, by analogy and proportion, to those of their superiors: and concerning these, he enjoins from this place as far as verse 9. As there are also, now under the gospel, two classes of men who watch over others in the Church of Christ, some "labouring in word," and others having charge in other ways (1 Tim. v. 17); so there are two parts of this enjoining: the one respects those who teach; the other, those who have charge in other ways in Christ's church. Both of these are exemplified by the apostle in the words already quoted, and that jointly, by their common object; for the apostle here denominates every one, under the gospel, who watches over others in the Church of Christ in any way—"one who is among them" (τὸν ὄντα ἐν αὐτοῖς) after the example of Solomon, who, in 1 Kings iii. 7, describes the duty of a king, by his "going out and coming in" among his subjects: 'he who is (ὁ ὤν) in the Church,' therefore, in the passage before us, is—'he that goes out and comes in, in the sight of God and of his Church, is one who has charge.' "Let him not be wise more than he ought to be wise; but let him be wise unto sobriety." This is the first part of the injunction, or that which respects those

who teach; illustrated, first of all, by a contrast, or if you please, by the contrary: for "to be wise unto sobriety," and "to be wise more than one ought," are contraries, although here distinguished by the marks of a contrast—"not (this)," "but (that.") The injunction, therefore, here given to those who teach is this—'let those who teach in the Church be wise with sobriety, and not more than they ought.' The excess of 'being wise,' (τοῦ φρονεῖν) which the apostle here prohibits, is not the excess of the gift itself, as if more of the gift of wisdom were given to any one than ought to be given; which was the mistake of Festus, and the objection wherewith he encountered Paul—"Paul! much learning doth drive thee mad" (Acts xxvi. 24): for the gift of wisdom, like all other gifts, is given to every one by the Spirit of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 11), who gives to each according to his own good-will, and whose will is the rule of just measure, so that neither excess nor defect can be detected in his gifts, which are given in due measure, with respect to the recipient; and, hence, the gifts which are here said to be 'given to every one according to the will of the Spirit of Christ,' are elsewhere said to be given—"according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph. iv. 7), to teach us, that the Spirit gives to every one in the measure that is due. This excess, therefore, is not in the gift, but in the estimation of ambitious man, arrogating to himself more than he ought, and that, indeed, variously. For some arrogate to themselves a wisdom which they do not possess; as the seven sons of Sceva, who laid claim to a knowledge of casting out devils and conjuring (Acts xix. 13, 14), although the event shows that they had received no such knowledge (v. 15). Others, who have really received the gift of wisdom, think that they have received it in a larger measure than they have received it; which was the error of Aaron and his sister Miriam, when they spake against Moses, (Numb. xii. 2.)—"Hath Jehovah spoken only by Moses? hath he not spoken by us also?" They say with truth, indeed, that Jehovah has spoken by them, and that they have been endowed with the gift of prophecy; but they are mistaken in this, that they think themselves endowed with it in an

equal measure with Moses, as appears from the reply of Jehovah (vv. 6, 7, 8, of the same chapter). Thirdly, others glory concerning a gift received, as if they had not received it; as those who are blamed on that account by the apostle in 1 Cor. iv. 7. Those, in fine, are said "to be wise more than they ought," (ὑπερ φρονεῖν) who are either busy-bodies,* and think that they can do all things by their own wisdom, even things to which they are by no means called by the Lord; or who, carried away by their opinion of their own wisdom, search into, and think themselves able to discover things, in the matter of faith and religion, which have not been revealed at all by the Lord in his word. In short, therefore, all those who are proud, either of a gift which they do not possess, or of a gift received as if they had not received it, or who are busy-bodies, and enquire into things not revealed, are said by the apostle in this place—"to be wise more than they ought" (ὑπερ φρονεῖν). "As God hath imparted to every one the measure of faith." Thus far the first part of this enjoining has been illustrated by the contrary: now comes a second illustration of the same from a definition of 'sober wisdom;' for "to be wise unto sobriety" (φρονεῖν εἰς τὴν σωφροσύνην) is—'to be wise according to the measure of faith which God has given to every one.' "Faith," in this place, is not as the Papists falsely and without authority affirm, a rule of faith, handed down from the apostles, apart from the written and only word, by which not only the profession and teaching of every one, but even the Scriptures themselves and the preaching of the apostles are to be tried; since Scripture itself is the rule of faith, nor is it to be tried by any other rule: but by "faith" is here meant—'the knowledge of faith,' or 'the knowledge of God through faith in Jesus Christ, which God has given to every one, out of the written word, through the operation of his Spirit; and hence, what is here termed "faith," is called, in 1 Cor. xii. 7—"the manifestation of the Spirit," (φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος,) or 'the knowledge of faith manifested through the Holy Spirit out of the written word.' This "faith," or 'know-

* Πολυπράγμονες.

ledge of God in Christ,' is not given in the same and equal measure to all, not even all who teach; but is given to each in his own and proper measure, according as it has seemed good to the Lord to give it to every one. "To be wise unto sobriety," accordingly, is—'in profession, and in teaching the Church, to keep soberly and modestly within the measure of the undoubted knowledge of God, namely, that most certain knowledge which God has freely given to every one through his Spirit, and which can be established by the genuine authority of the written word.' The first part, therefore, of this injunction, enjoins on those who teach in the Church—since all have not the same illumination from the word, but each knows according to the measure of knowledge which has been given him—enjoins, I say, that neither in profession should any one presume on knowledge above his measure, nor in teaching set forth any thing except what is most certainly known from the written word of God, as the standard of truth.

4. The apostle here stops to explain the definition of 'sober wisdom' which he has given at the close of the preceding verse; and illustrates what is there said, viz.—'that God has not imparted the same measure of faith to every one.' The argument by which it is illustrated is drawn from an extended similitude, the protasis of which is contained in this verse, and consists of two parts. "For as we have many members in one body." This is the first part of the protasis—"we have many members in one body;" where by "body" he means—'the human body,' or 'that of the outward man.'* "But all the members have not the same action." This is the second part of the protasis concerning the different duty, and gift for duty, of each individual member as compared with the rest; which difference or diversity, both of duty and gift, the apostle here expresses by the different action of each member: the members of the external body have not all the same action, but every one its own proper action, distinct from

* Τοῦ ἔξω ἀνθρώπου.

the actions of the other members; whence it follows—since action ought to be conformable to duty, and duty is according to gift—that every member in this external body of ours has both its own proper gift and duty, distinct from the gift and duty of any other member. Accordingly, in the protasis, he lays this foundation, as it were, of his illustration—'that, seeing there are many members in our one body, every one has its own gift from God, its own duty according to that gift, and its own action according to that duty; by each of which every individual member is distinguished from the rest.'

5. We have here the apodosis of the comparison, of which there are, in like manner, two parts. "So we, (being) many, are one body in Christ." This is the first part of the apodosis:—'as there are many members in this one external body of ours, so we, being many, are one mystical body in Jesus Christ;' the foundation of which you will find in 1 Cor. xii. 13, viz.—'that all we who are in Christ have been baptized by one Spirit into one body.' Moreover, this is said to be done "in Christ," both because he himself is "the head," (Eph. i. 22;) and because that one Spirit has been given to every member as the source of the new life, or life of God in each, and of all the spiritual gifts which belong to that life—by him as the head of the Church. In fine, by the "many" here, you are to understand—'each of those who are in Christ, but especially those who teach:' for the apostle is here speaking chiefly of them, as appears from the subsequent induction; and of each of them, as has before appeared from the definition, where it is said—that "God has imparted to every one," that is, 'to each and every one who teaches,' "the measure of faith." This 'multitude of members,' however, may be otherwise taken for—'the multitude of assemblies or congregations which are united in Christ, as the greater members in the body;' in which sense we find the multitude of the member of Christ spoken of in 1 Cor. xii. 27—"Moreover, ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular:" where, when he says—"body," he means 'assembly,'

and when he calls them—"members," he indicates that the Corinthian Church was 'a member, or particular assembly,' as compared with other assemblies, or churches of Christ. "And one by one members of each other." This is the second part of the apodosis, by which two things are expressed: first—'that every one who is in Christ, apart, but especially he who teaches or labours in the word, is furnished with his own separate gift in the mystical body of Christ, for his own duty in the body, and the performance of that duty;' secondly—'that as the gift, and duty, and performance of duty of each have reference to the good of the whole body, so ought they to have reference to the good of every other member.' The apostle therefore says, 'that every one is a member, not merely of the body, but also of every other member in the body;' not as being properly a member of a member, but because the action of each member is subservient to the use of every other; for although the eye in the external body is not a member of the foot, but of the body, yet inasmuch as it serves the foot by its action, it is in some sort a member of the foot also, namely, as respects use. In like manner, although every one who is in Christ is, properly speaking, a member of the body, yet he may also be said to be a member of every other; because, whatever gift he has received from the common Lord, he has received for the use of every member.

6. He now returns to the injunction concerning those who 'are in,' or have charge in the Church of God, and subjoins the second part of it, wherein he prohibits all those who in any way have charge of Christ's flock, from the abuse of the gifts which they have received for the edification and advantage of the Church of God; as the apostle elsewhere testifies that "the manifestation of the Spirit" * is given to every one who has it "for profit," † namely, for the benefit and advantage of the Church. This part of the injunction is accordingly distinguished from the preceding, inasmuch as the apostle has there prohibited arrogance in the case of any

* Φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος. † Πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον.

one assuming what he does not possess, or being "more wise than he ought to be wise;" whereas he here prohibits the abuse of a gift received. The second part of the enjoining, therefore, is this —'whoever in any way has charge in the Church of God, should rightly and faithfully use the gift which he has received for the benefit of the Church, and not abuse it.' This, which is the general proposition of the second part of the injunction, the apostle omits; illustrating it, however, both by its cause, and by a special induction of particulars. "But having different gifts according to the grace which has been given unto us." This is the cause of the second part of the injunction; from which the apostle thus reasons:—

'We who are in the Church of God, and have charge of Christ's flock, have received different gifts, and these proceeding from the Spirit, through grace;' or, which is the same thing—'we have received gifts, every one his own, and that freely from God, through the Spirit:

'Let no one therefore abuse his gift, but let every one use it for the benefit of the Church;'

"Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith,"

7. "Or ministry, let us be occupied in ministering." We have here the second illustration of the second part, from an induction in which he reduces all the gifts of those who have charge in the Church of God to two classes: The one he denominates "prophecy," (προφητείαν;) the other, "ministry" (διακονίαν.) "Prophecy" I call 'the gift of teaching,' and "ministry" embraces the other gifts, all the gifts, namely, of those who, though not teachers, have charge in the Church. We find both these words thus used in other places. So προφητεύω or προφητεία is used in (1 Cor. xiv. 3,) where a 'prophet' is said to be one that "speaketh unto men," that is, either "to the edification" of the Church of God as a teacher, or "to exhortation and comfort" as a pastor; "prophecy," therefore, is here put for 'any gift of teaching;' al-

though it is true that it is elsewhere employed in a narrower sense, as in Eph. vi. 11. Διακονία here, taken in a wider acceptation, comprehends all other duties in the Church of God besides the office of teaching; in this sense the term is also used in 1 Tim. iii. 8, &c., where, after he has shewn what sort of persons "bishops" or 'those who teach in the Church' should be, he describes "deacons," that is, 'those who, though not teaching, have charge in other ways in the Church of God;' as appears from his requiring in the former that they be "apt to teach," but not in the latter; although it is true that the term διακονία is found employed in the New Testament, both in a wider sense for every office in the Church, so as even to include the apostles, (2 Cor. iv. 1;) and in a narrower sense for those who, neither teaching, nor watching over the morals of the Church, have only charge of the poor and the Church treasury, (Phil. i. 1.) The apostle illustrates both these particulars of the induction by the adjunct of the manner, and a subdivision of the particulars. The adjunct of the manner of the first particular, inasmuch as it is general, is joined to the genus, to be afterwards repeated under the several species. The manner in this case is—that he who has received the gift of prophesying or of teaching should teach—"according to the analogy" or proportion of faith." By "the analogy of faith" here, we may understand what he has before denominated—"the measure of faith," or even—'the articles of faith' collected out of the written word, and comprised in that Confession of Faith which has been received from the very commencement of the Christian Church, and which, as being conformable to the teaching of the apostles, is commonly called—*the Apostles' creed*: in whatever sense the term be taken, the prophet is enjoined not to depart, in prophesying, from the common foundations which he has understood with certainty from the word of God. "Both he that teacheth, in teaching; and he that exhorteth, in exhortation." He subdivides 'the prophet' into 'the teacher,' properly so called, and 'the pastor,' (Eph. iv. 11;) both of whom are bound, the one to teach, and the other to feed the flock of Christ "according to the proportion of

faith." By 'the teacher' I understand 'him who, with simplicity and honesty, interprets the word, as the knowledge of it is preserved in the Church; and by 'the pastor' 'him who addresses the Church, according to the known principles of the word, in exhortation, admonition, reproof, &c., (for all these are here, by synecdoche, included under the term "exhortation,") and therewith combines for the further consolation of the Church, the administration of the sacraments, according as the word directs. "He that distributeth with simplicity; he that presideth with diligence; he that sheweth mercy with cheerfulness." He now illustrates the second particular of the induction, or "the ministry," * both by a subdivision of the 'deacons' † or 'ministers,' and by the adjunct of the manner of ministering. Three species of deacons or ministers are here enumerated:—(1.) "Those who distribute;" (2.) "Those who preside;" (3.) "Those who shew mercy." "Those who distribute," I understand to be "those who, in the narrowest sense of the words, are denominated *deacons;* with whom is the care of the treasury of the Church, that they may collect into it, and distribute from it, for the benefit of the poor.' "Those who preside" or 'presidents,' I understand to be those whom the apostle, in 1 Tim. v. 17. calls 'elders not labouring in the word,' and whom, in 1 Cor. xii. 28, he terms, "governors;" these are 'they who, along with the teachers and pastors, watch over the discipline and morals of the house of God.' The third species are "those who shew mercy," that is, 'who relieve the wretched,' and whom the apostle, in the passage quoted from the epistle to the Corinthians, calls "helpers;" under which title I understand, not private Christians contributing of their own substance to the relief of the poor, for the apostle is here speaking of those who have charge publicly in the Church; but by "those who shew mercy," I understand here—'those who, having received the alms of the Church from the guardians of the Church treasury, apply them to benefit of the afflicted poor, especially those who are labouring under any sickness.' Among "those who shew mercy," therefore, is

* Διακονίαν. † Διακόνων.

included that order in the Church which, in Acts vi., and 1 Tim. v., is denominated the order of "widows;" although the whole order is here expressed in the masculine gender, as being one in which males, no less than females, are required: for the afflicted poor, especially the sick, have need, not only of widows to nurse and watch them, but also of surgeons and physicians, and other men of that sort, who are necessary for their comfort in their sicknesses. This is the subdivision of the deacons. The second amplification of the deacons is taken from the adjunct of the manner of ministering (διακονίας). Here, however, the adjunct of the manner, not being common, like that of those who teach, but peculiar in the case of each species of deacons, is not subjoined to the genus, as we have before seen the manner of prophesying subjoined to the gift of prophecy, viz., 'that it should be "according to the proportion of faith" (κατ' ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως); but to each species of deacons their own manner of ministering is subjoined: (1.) In those who distribute, "simplicity" is required; (2.) In those who preside, "diligence" in watching over the morals of the people; (3.) In those who shew mercy, "cheerfulness." By 'simplicity in those who distribute' I understand—'that integrity, whereby they keep back nothing which has been contributed for the benefit of the poor; nor lay out any thing with respect of persons, but in proportion to the necessities of the recipients, and according to the appointment of the eldership:' the more so, because this respect of persons has disturbed the Church of Christ from its very infancy; as we see in Acts vi. 1, where the slighting of the Grecian widows in the ministration is mentioned as the occasion of the first dissension in the Christian Church. The virtue of elders who do not teach, and their legitimate manner of ministering is "diligence;" and denotes 'their sedulous assiduity, or assiduous sedulity in attending to the morals of the people,' as those upon whom it is more incumbent to attend to morals, than upon ministers themselves, or those who labour in the word: for the latter are distracted from such diligence by the ministry of the word and doctrine; as Peter would intimate when he says (Acts vi. 2)

"it is not good that we should leave the word of God, and administer tables." The peculiar virtue of those who shew mercy is "cheerfulness," inasmuch as, in their official capacity, their business lies with the afflicted and wretched; and because if, in ministering, they appear morose, and disgusted with the distress of those to whom they minister, they will aggravate the affliction of the persons to whom they ought to bring consolation: it is therefore required of them that they execute the ministry which they perform towards the afflicted with cheerfulness, and in such a way as to alleviate their affliction.

9. Thus far we have had the ordinary duties of those who have charge in the Church of Christ, which are to be attended to with unvarying equity, even to the second coming of the Lord. From these we have said that the duties of the flock are to be inferred by analogy. Thus, if the teacher teaches according to the proportion of faith, the Church should also learn and advance in the knowledge of the gospel of peace, according to the proportion of faith; and if the pastor shall exhort, admonish, threaten, administer the sacraments, and, along with the elders, who do not teach, administer discipline, the flock ought also to obey them according to the analogy of faith, and that lovingly, for their work's sake, as the apostle elsewhere (1 Thess. v. 12, 13) enjoins upon the flock. Nor should a twofold honour be wanting in the Church to the deacon, namely, first, the honour due to him as a Christian man; and, next, that due to his office as deacon, (*διακονίας*,) whether he 'distribute with simplicity,' or 'shew mercy with cheerfulness.'

Next come the duties which are common at once to the flock and to those who have charge of it; the source and origin of all which is "love" or affection. "Let love be unfeigned." What, and of what sort love ought to be in all, both in the flock and in those who have charge of the flock, is described in these words, from the disparate. 'Love,' simple and sincere in its nature, is uniformly seen in the face and actions, as proceeding from the heart; the 'feigning of love,' or love appearing in the face or ac-

tions, and not proceeding at all from the heart, is diverse from true love. The apostle, therefore, here commands that love should not be feigned, but that, in as far as any one manifests love either in his words or his actions, so far should his inward consciousness be witness to him that he loves with the heart. To this agrees the saying of John, (1st Epist. iii. 18,) "My little children, let us not love in word or tongue," that is, 'in word or tongue only,' as those who love feignedly; "but" also "in deed," which is something more than to love in word only; "and," moreover, "in truth" (ἀληθείᾳ) likewise, which has its seat in the heart. This is the foundation of the common duties. Next comes a general proposition, consisting of two members:—(1.) "Abhor that which is evil;" (2.) "Cleave to that which is good." This proposition is borrowed from Ps. xxxiv. 15, (Tremellius's version,) and comprises the sum of the law in two parts—the first being a prohibition of that which is evil, and the second containing an injunction about doing that which is good; whence we are called upon to observe, that there is a twofold duty to which sincere love binds us, and that there is a twofold sin opposed to the duty of love, which all we who love unfeignedly ought to abhor. The first duty is here said by the apostle to be—'such a performance of what is good, as may make it manifest to all who witness it, that, in performing, we cleave to that which is good;' the second duty is—'such a hatred and abhorrence of that which is evil, that all who behold it in our actions may perceive that we are so separated from what is evil, as to abhor it with our whole souls.' Hence, there appears on the other hand a twofold sin, or a sin of two kinds: the one consists—'in doing what is evil, which is increased, if, in the doing, there be seen in us who do it a delight in the evil which we do, the opposite of that abhorrence of evil which is required in the sound doctrine of the gospel;' the second kind of sin is—'the neglecting to perform, or even the cold performance of what is good, from which all who witness our conduct easily arrive at the conclusion, that we by no means cleave to that which is good.'

10. Thus far we have had the foundation of Christian duty—"love unfeigned." Thus far also we have had the proposition, consisting of two members: (1.) 'to abhor that which is evil;' (2.) 'to cleave to that which is good.' Next comes an explication of the proposition, in which, although the law of God, contained in the Decalogue, is as a lamp to the feet of those who have embraced the gospel, yet the apostle, in enjoining duty, does not proceed precept by precept, or according to the order of the commandments of the Decalogue, but takes up the tables, and imposes duties on the Christian Church, as the tables of the law require. These duties are of two kinds; some which are common, without any special relation or respect, from this verse, as far as verse 13; others with special relation or respect, from verse 13, to the end of the chapter. The injunctions of the former kind are threefold; those which come first, in the 10th verse, respect the second table of the law; the next, in verse 11, respect both tables; and the last, in verse 12, the first table.

The absolute injunctions, or injunctions of the first kind which respect the second table of the law, are two; just as the duties which the second table of the law recommends to the people of God are twofold; for the second table enjoins those things which are due to men in the Lord, and that, indeed, in a twofold manner, either generally, by every one to every other, or particularly, what any one ought to perform to another, according to his rank and condition. "In brotherly love be kindly affectionate one to another." This is the first injunction which respects the second table of the law, comprising in a few words, and as it were in the form of an abridgement, the latter precepts of the second table, concerning that zeal for life, virtue, property and reputation, which every one should affectionately so cherish in himself towards another, of whatever state or condition, as to abstain from the contrary appetite or desire. And the apostle points to that common brotherhood which all who have embraced the gospel have in Jesus Christ, as the foundation of this injunction; for there is this difference between the love of the law and that of the gospel,

(since even the law, apart from the gospel, urges love,) that the love of the gospel is the love of brethren indeed, but of brethren regenerated in Jesus Christ; whereas that of the law is the love of brethren in the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα) only. "In honour going before each other." This is the second injunction having respect to the second table of the law; which he extends, in an evangelical acceptation, (κατ' εὐαγγέλιον) as a commentary upon the first precept of the second table: for there, in a legal sense, every one who is inferior in state, condition, age, or in any other respect according to the flesh, is commanded to shew honour to his superior; but the apostle, propounding the precept in an evangelical sense, commands that, in the judgment of love, every one who is in Christ should esteem another who is equally in Christ, as "before," or 'superior to' himself, and should honour him on account of the grace that is in him. For so the apostle explains his own meaning in many places:—"Consider those who walk so, as ye have us for an example" (Phil. iii. 17); "We pray you, brethren, to acknowledge those who labour among you, and preside over you in the Lord, and admonish you, so as to esteem them exceedingly dear for their work's sake" (1 Thess. v. 12, 13); "Obey and be subject to those who rule over you" (Heb. xiii. 17); in all which places, writing to churches, and even to the more powerful (δυνάστας) in those Churches, he yet charges them to submit themselves to the preachers of the gospel, how humble, and of how despicable a condition soever according to the flesh,* on account of the grace of preaching, or the grace given to them to preach the gospel. But this is proved in a more general manner by what the apostle says in commending Onesimus to his master, as well as by the common injunction (Eph. vi. 9)—"Ye masters do that which is just unto your servants, leaving off threatening, (ἀνιέντες τὴν ἀπειλήν), knowing that your own master also is in heaven, and that there is no respect of persons with him:" in which words the apostle most distinctly charges even the powerful masters in the

* Comp. Col. iv. 1. (Translator.)

Church, to observe, cherish, and honour according to its measure, the measure of grace in the meanest of their servants.

11. "In endeavour, not slothful; in spirit, fervent; serving the Lord." We have next the three injunctions respecting both tables of the law: the first concerning 'endeavour;' the second concerning 'zeal according to knowledge;' the third regarding 'the object or aim to which Christians should constantly have respect in all their endeavours and zeal.' I call "endeavour"—'the sedulous outward diligence of a Christian man in performing the duties, either of the first or of the second table: the apostle enjoins that this should be 'earnest;' but by meosis, to avoid offending the tender consciences of Christians, instead of saying—'earnest endeavour,' he commands them to avoid the charge of 'sloth' in performing these duties of a Christian man. "Zeal"—I consider to be—'inward ardour propelling the outward members of the body, so that these may be "the instruments of righteousness" to the glory of God, in the practice either of the first, or of the second table of the law: this zeal he has elsewhere (c. ix. v. 3,) professed; and by this zeal, the conduct of our Lord in overturning the tables, and casting out those who traded as merchants in the house of God, is defended out of the Psalms, in Matt. xxi. 13.* The third injunction is annexed to each of the preceding, as an epanorthosis, whereby the apostle charges and enjoins upon the Church to take heed to themselves both in endeavour and zeal; because we see both endeavour and zeal which are not in the Lord: he would therefore have them watch attentively, that in whatever they do by endeavour or zeal, they may serve the Lord, and see that they be not hurried along to any thing, either by inward zeal or outward endeavour, unless both the spirit and word of the Lord lead the way.

12. "In hope, rejoicing; in afflictions, patiently enduring; in prayer, continuing constantly." Here follow, in the third place,

* This seems to be an error; the passage is John ii. 17. (Translator.)

the injunctions respecting the first table of the law; which are three in number: the first is—'the joy of the Holy Spirit,' of which 'the hope that putteth not to shame' is pointed out as the foundation; the second is of 'patient endurance,' or 'patience in afflictions;' the third, concerning 'the prayers of faith continued in with joy and patience.' 'Hope' is laid down as the foundation of 'joy,' because, although already "sons," yea, "heirs," yea, "joint-heirs with Jesus Christ," we do not yet see what we shall be; and although all things are ours, whosoever of us are Jesus Christ's, nevertheless, we possess by right only, not being yet in actual possession, but hoping, and that with the 'hope that putteth not to shame,' that the time will come when we shall be in actual possession of all things. So long as we are here, therefore, the subject matter of our joy is not future possession, but the hope of future possession, as it is said, chap. v. 2—"We glory in hope of the glory of God." 'Patient endurance in affliction' is recommended to us, both because affliction, or the cross, is the lot of the sons of God in the present life; and because patient endurance can neither be, nor be seen, except where there is suffering in the case of him who so endures: hence the apostle says—'that suffering produces patience.' The third injunction is subjoined, as an admonition, to each of the preceding, lest either joy should cause us to forget, or affliction to lay aside 'prayer;' against both of which evils Christians must be upon their guard: for we are both ready to become remiss in prosperity; and in trials, we have need of the apostolic exhortation—'be not afraid, in any thing, on account of those who are opposed to you' (Phil. i. 28), and again—'but let your prayers be heard before God, continued in with thanksgiving' (Phil. iv. 6).

13. "Communicating to the necessities of the saints; following after hospitality." Next come the relative injunctions, which are twofold, according to the twofold relation or respect which limits and makes them particular: for that particular relation or respect involving duty has for its subject, either others, from v. 13 to v. 19; or ourselves, from v. 19 to the end. The relation or respect

of which others are the subject, arises from a threefold foundation: first, from the different sorts of men with whom we live, vv. 13, 14; then, from the different mental affections of those with whom we live, v. 15; and, thirdly, from their different effects, vv. 16, 17, 18. As regards the first, or the different sorts of men with whom we live, the apostle divides all men into—'saints,' and 'persecutors' (*διωκόντας*); where he would have us observe in passing, that all who are not, along with us, partakers of the Holy Spirit unto sanctification, are 'persecutors' (*διωκόντες*) of the saints: as also appears from the first announcement of the gospel, (Gen. iii. 15), whence the apostle appears to borrow this distribution; for as all men are there divided into 'the seed of the serpent' and 'the seed of the Church;' so it is distinctly stated that there will be perpetual war and persecution on the part of the seed of the serpent against the seed of the Church, until at length the head of the serpent shall be bruised, as is fully unfolded by the apostle in Rev. xii. Concerning our duty towards the saints, he gives two injunctions: the first relates to that sacred 'communication' (*κοινωνίας*), whereby we relieve the poverty of the saints and the necessities of our brethren, according to the measure of the bounties conferred upon us; the second, enjoining the exercise of hospitality towards others.

14. "Bless those who persecute you; bless (I say) and curse not." Concerning persecutors,* and our duty towards them, there is but one injunction—"bless them;" which the apostle amplifies by repetition—"bless (I say)," and by the prohibition of the contrary—"curse not." By such solicitude and earnest commendation of this duty, the apostle would teach us two things:—the first is, that in the remains of the flesh and corrupt nature (*τῇ φύσει*), we are prone to curse those who persecute us; the second, that in the zeal of God and in the strength of the Spirit, we should especially strive against this corruption of the flesh, and endeavour to bless even our very persecutors, that, if such only be the will of

* Τῶν διωκόντων.

God, they may, by our blessing, be withdrawn from their cursing, and led to the God of our blessing.

15. "Rejoice with those who rejoice, and weep with those who weep." The second relation or respect of which others are the subject, arises from the different mental affections and internal emotions which we see in those with whom we live. According to these emotions the apostle divides all men into—"those who rejoice," and "those who weep," that is, 'those who are affected either with joy or grief; and enjoins upon Christians—'to sympathise with both, and to be affected in like manner with them, so as to rejoice with those who rejoice, and to weep with those who weep.'

16. "Be of the same mind one towards another." This is the third relation or respect of which the persons with whom we live are the subjects; according to which the apostle divides all men into—'those who either affect us with good as members of the same body,' or 'with evil as opposed to us in a different body.' The Christian duty to be performed towards both is set forth by the apostle in two ways: separately, in this 16th verse, and the beginning of the next; and jointly, in the close of verse 17, and in verse 18.

The duty to be performed towards those who are members of the same body and do us good, or are our helpers for good, is set forth in this verse, and is threefold. First of all there is—'unanimity and consent of mind in every thing that is good;' for otherwise, 'to be unanimous,'* or "to be of the same mind one toward another,"† and harmonious in evil, is not only not a Christian duty, but is an agreeing together contrary to duty: the apostle therefore enjoins that they should avoid feuds and altercations, such as are everywhere seen to arise among men from the flesh and our corrupt nature. "Not thinking highly (of yourselves) but yielding to the lowly." The second duty to be performed towards our brethren, or

* Ὁμοφρονεῖν. † Τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονεῖν.

those who are members of the same body with ourselves, is—'genuine humility and the shunning of pride, as contrary to Christian humility.' Of this duty, two parts are here distinguished by the apostle, opposed to the twofold pride which is seen in men: the first is—'not to think highly of ourselves and of our own gifts;' the second is—'to submit ourselves and yield to the most lowly and least members in the Church, for their edification in the common grace:' whilst, on the other hand, there are in like manner the two following parts of pride: the one—'too high an esteem of ourselves and of our own gifts;' the other—'the contempt and rejection of our weak brethren.' This duty, compared with the preceding, is the cause of the former; for as pride breaks up concord, so Christian humility both produces the same, and preserves it when produced. "Be not wise in your own eyes." This is the third duty, viz. 'the shunning of that self complacency* whereby one is pleased with his own opinions;' which is contrary to the spirit of discernment, whereby one discerning modestly and wisely, both in regard to his own conceptions, and those of others who are his brethren, chooses and holds fast that which is truly good: for a man is said to be "wise in his own eyes," when he is so puffed up with an opinion of his own wisdom, as neither to think, nor endure it to be thought, that there is any understanding except what he himself understands and thinks. This 'self-complacency' we may take either as a separate vice, or as the third and last degree of that pride which we have mentioned as contrary to Christian humility. I prefer, however, to view it in the former light, as the vice which is opposed to that peculiar Christian duty or gift, which, as before observed, is denominated 'the spirit of discernment.'†

17. "Rendering again evil for evil unto no man." Next comes the duty which is to be performed by the Christian towards those who do him evil, and are in a different mystical body from that which he himself is in, and that a body opposed to him. The

* Ἀυθαδείας.

† Or ἀυθάδεια may be rendered—'presumption;' and *discretio*—'discretion.—Tr.

body which is opposed to the mystical body of Jesus Christ, is that which we have before denominated—"the seed of the serpent," or, as John speaks—"the offspring of vipers;" 'the children of their father the devil,' and, if we may so express it—'the mystical body of Satan.' These can do nothing but evil to the saints, or those who are members of Jesus Christ: yet the apostle commands the Christian to receive these very persons—doing him evil, and as it were opposed to him in an opposite body—in a Christian manner, and dutifully: and he sets forth the duty which he wishes to be performed towards them by meosis, viz. by forbidding the neglect of the duty—'do not render evil to those who do evil to you;' instead of saying—as he might have said, and afterwards indeed does say—'receive those who do evil to you, by doing good to them.' There is one expression, however, used in prescribing this duty, which is especially worthy of remark; for the apostle does not say—'do not render again evil for evil to the evil or *ungodly*,' but commands that evil instead of good should be rendered "*to no man*." By this he would intimate, that it is not only the evil and wicked who do evil to the Christian, but that even a Christian may do evil to a Christian, and those who are members of the same mystical body in Jesus Christ may injure each other, as David did Uriah; the apostle, therefore, in order to extend this duty beyond the ungodly and those who are opposed to us, enjoins upon the Christian to render again evil for evil "to no man," whether an ungodly man or a brother: and it is certainly most agreeable to reason, that if we pardon an ungodly man doing us evil, we should still more pardon a brother doing us injury through infirmity.

Thus far we have had the duty to be performed by the Christian, both to those that do him good, and to those that do him evil, separately: now follows the duty to be performed to both jointly, which is twofold. "Attending to things honourable in the sight of all men." This is the first injunction, wherein the apostle enjoins that the Christian should conduct himself honourably in his whole conversation and doings, so that, in what he does, he may

be free from blame or censure on the part of any man, whether in the Church or out of the Church; yet, at the same time, taking care that what he honourably attends to and does, he should so do, that he may be able to take his stand on the authority of the Word of God, in reply to any one, whether good or bad, who examines him; and may proceed with confidence in the doing of it, being ready to answer for the honourableness of what he does to any one who requires of him an account of his conduct. I thus extend the injunction generally; not denying, however, that it has a special reference to that zeal whereby a man strives to secure, either for himself or others, the outward blessings of life: in this, especially, the apostle commands that the Christian should be seen to be honourable, both by the godly and ungodly; as we find that the apostle himself acted, from 2 Cor. viii. 21, where he defends his zeal in making a collection through the Gentile Churches, to relieve the poverty of the saints in Judea, (of which Agabus gave warning, Acts xi. 28), by this very Christian duty, namely, that in making that collection, he was attending to things honourable in the sight of God and men.

18. "If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, living at peace with all men." This is the second injunction which the Christian should observe towards both the godly, and the ungodly, jointly:—'the Christian should live at peace with every man, whether godly or ungodly.' So Abraham lived at peace with the Syrian brothers, Eschol and Aner, (Gen. xiv. 13); Isaac with Abimelech; Heber the proselyte, with Jabin; and so Paul himself became all things to all men, in order that, living at peace with all, he might, from among all, gain some to Christ. The apostle, however, restricts this injunction about living at peace, by a twofold restriction, whereby he reminds us in passing, that the present life is not the life of our peace; and that we shall not be able to live at peace with all men here in a holy manner, inasmuch as our life is laid up with God in Christ, in the heavens. The first restriction is—"as much as lieth in you;" the meaning of which is this:—'it is cer-

tain that your peace in this life is disturbed,' for he has before said that there are some who persecute and do evil to the sons of the Church; 'however,' says the apostle, 'let not an occasion of disturbing your peace proceed from yourselves, but, as much as lieth in you, cultivate peace even with the wicked.' The second restriction of the injunction is expressed in these words, when the apostle says—"if it be possible;" by which he would intimate that it is impossible but that an occasion for disturbing our peace may proceed from ourselves; for we who believe on Christ must retain, along with faith, the confession of the mouth; and a wicked world will endure neither the one, nor the other, with peace. The apostle therefore enjoins upon the Christian not to disturb his own peace for the sake of the things of this world; at the same time admonishing him, if troubled by a wicked world on account of his religion, not to abandon either his faith or profession for the sake of the peace of the world: because, although the occasion must often unavoidably proceed from himself; yet the cause is to be found in the wicked who persecute the faith. From this the apostle gives us to learn the following things: First—that it is impossible, in this world of wicked men, but that an occasion of disturbing the peace of the Church may proceed from the Church herself and her sons: for if the Church could have avoided all occasion for the disturbance of her peace, the apostle would have said—'be at peace with all,' and would not have added—"if it be possible;" but, by adding this condition—"if it be possible," he would intimate, that it is impossible that the Church or any of her sons, continuing to belong to God, should be at peace with the world. Thus Noah must either have contended with the world, or ceased to persevere in the hope of being saved when the waters should overwhelm the wicked; so Moses must either have offended God or Pharaoh; and so it was necessary for Abimelech, either to have refused to do his duty to David, or to afford an occasion to Saul for the slaughter, both of himself, and his family. This last example merits our attention, in order that we who are saints may be able to distinguish between the cause, and the occasion, of the dis-

turbance of the peace of the Church. The occasion sometimes proceeds from the Church herself; but the cause is always found in the wicked: just as the occasion of Abimelech's death proceeded from himself, and the duty which he piously performed to David; whereas the cause was found in Saul, who could not hear a word about duty performed to David, on account of the evil disposition by which he was actuated towards him. And from this we learn another difference between the cause and occasion of the disturbance of the peace of the Church; the cause is always accompanied with sin; but the occasion may be without sin, inasmuch as it may be impossible to avoid either deserting our duty, or giving occasion to a wicked world to disturb our peace. The apostle therefore commands us to cultivate peace—"if it be possible;" intimating that it is often impossible, if we keep the path of duty in which it behoves us to persevere. Secondly, we are to observe from the apostle here—that whenever an occasion for disturbing our peace can be avoided without sin, it ought to be avoided: for so the apostle speaks—'cultivate peace as much as lieth in you;' that is—'as far as you can avoid an occasion for the disturbance of your peace without sin, avoid it.' And it is most worthy of observation, in the third place—that the Christian cannot do that which he is unable to do without sin: for so the apostle here says, that sometimes it does not 'lie in us' to avoid an occasion for the disturbance of our peace; inasmuch as that often cannot be done without sin on our part.

Thus far we have had the relation or respect of which others are the subject, according to which the apostle has commended to Christians the various duties incumbent upon them: next comes the second relation and respect, which is seen in Christians themselves, whom the apostle therefore calls his "beloved;" according to which relation or respect of which they are themselves the subjects, there devolves upon them a duty to be performed to others, in the Lord, and that the gospel of God, which they profess, may be well spoken of even among those that are without, when they see that duty performed by them. According to this respect

which is seen in Christians themselves, the apostle divides Christians into two classes; to some, injury has been done; others are aimed at that they may be injured. Upon each of these classes, according to their state and condition, there devolves a Christian duty; which the apostle sets forth, as above, first separately, in vv. 19 and 20; then jointly, in the last verse. "Not avenging yourselves." This is the duty of Christians to whom injury has been done, separately; which the apostle sets forth by arsis and thesis, or by prohibition and injunction contrasted. The prohibition is—'that they should not themselves avenge the injuries which they have received from others;' which is the usual and daily practice of the natural man and the world who know not Jehovah, namely, to take vengeance upon each other for injuries received. "But give place unto wrath." This is the thesis, or second member of the contrast, wherein the apostle shews Christians, affirmatively, the duty which devolves upon them whenever injury is done to them; their duty is—'to give place unto wrath.' This, some understand of their own wrath; so that the meaning will be—'that Christians who have been injured should spare this wrath, lest they be carried along by it to the immediate avenging of their injuries, which is the manner and custom of a perishing world.' Others understand it of the wrath of God: so that the meaning will be—'that those who have received injuries should not be wroth unto vengeance, but should leave those who do them evil, if they repent not, to the wrath of Jehovah, so that their own wrath may give place to the wrath of Jehovah, and that to him, the glory of inflicting vengeance upon the wicked, in his most just wrath, may be ascribed.'

Others, again, explain it of the adversary who does the injury; so that the meaning will be—'that Christians, like their Father, should exercise forbearance, waiting, with much long-suffering, if perchance God may grant repentance even to those who do them evil and injure them. I consider that these three senses are included by the apostle in the words——"Give place unto wrath"—taken by themselves; for the duty of giving place unto wrath is established in all these senses, jointly, by the argument which the

apostle subjoins,—"For it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." The apostle establishes both the arsis and thesis by the authority of God, taken from the law, Deut. xxxii. 35, thus:—

'The avenging of injuries belongs to Jehovah alone, who promises that he will repay, and will perform his promise:

'Therefore Christians and those who believe on Jehovah should not avenge their own injuries;

'Therefore, also, they should spare their wrath, that they may give opportunity to God for being wroth with the wicked, if they repent not, and for avenging, in his most just wrath, the injuries done by them to his people; which is *his* prerogative, as the authority of the quotation from the Scriptures proves.

20. "Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst give him drink." By "enemy," I understand here—'the enemy of Christians who aims to do them injury:' this injunction, therefore, inculcates the duty separately devolving on the Christian who is aimed at by an enemy, that injury may be done to him. The duty is this—'that the Christian should encounter the enemy who so aims at injuring him, by doing him good; but the apostle propounds the genus or general injunction in the form of a twofold particular duty, borrowed from the Scriptures: 'If your enemy,' that is 'he who would deprive you both of food and life, be hungry, encounter him by feeding him, and ministering what is necessary to his wants; in like manner, if he thirsts, give him drink.' This injunction the apostle establishes by two arguments. First of all, he deduces it from the previous injunction, by reasoning from the greater to the less:—

'The Christian should not avenge injuries received:

'Therefore, what is less, he should not encounter an enemy, who seeks, in the manner of an enemy, to injure him, by offering injury, but by doing him good instead of injury; and this deduction the apostle indicates by the term "therefore," (οὖν) in the beginning of the verse.

"For if thou do so, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head." This is the second argument for the injunction, which is allegorical, and taken from the same Scripture (Prov. xxv. 21, 22) whence the injunction itself was borrowed. By this allegory, the Holy Spirit indicates, that if the Christian does good to him who desires to do him evil, he will render his enemy, or him who desires to do him evil, if he repent not, inexcusable (ἀναπολογητον) by so doing; and will thus heap up for him wrath against the day of wrath, and judgment against the day of the just judgment of God; for as coals of fire, placed on the head, torment the man on whose head they are placed, so the good deed performed by a godly man towards his enemy, will torment him, both in this life with the consciousness of his injury and inexcusableness,* and for ever, if he repent not, by the heaping up of the wrath and judgment of God. Of this we have an example, in the justification of David by Saul, which he extorted from his enemy, again and again, by doing him good. (1 Samuel xxiv. 18; xxvi. 21.)

21. "Be not overcome by what is evil, but overcome malice by goodness."

This is the injunction concerning the duty which jointly devolves, both upon the Christian who has suffered injury, and upon him who is aimed at by an enemy that he may be injured;—it devolves on both, jointly, not to be overcome by the evil deed of him who does evil to the one, or has wished to do evil to the other; but it devolves on the Christian to overcome the malice of both by his own goodness. 'To be overcome by evil' is—'to be induced by the evil deed of a wicked man to do evil to him in return,' but 'to overcome malice by goodness' is—'to be so superior to our enemies, whether they have done us evil, or have wished to do us evil in time to come, that they may be compelled, by the evidence of our goodness and performance of duty, frankly to justify us, as Saul did David.'

* Ἀναπολογησίας.

CHAPTER XIII.

Thus far, in chap. xii., the apostle has prescribed to Christians the Christian duties which devolve upon them as members of the Church of Jesus Christ. Since Christians should also live dutifully in the world, and without offence among those that are without, he now proceeds, in this 13th chap., to prescribe the duties to be performed by them in the state. These, like those in the preceding chap., are partly relative, or such as arise from a particular respect, as far as ver. 7; partly common, thence to ver. 11; whence, to the end of the chap., he winds up, by a common conclusion as it were, his injunctions of both kinds concerning morals—both those which are suited to Christians as members of the Church, and those which are suited to them as members of the state. This chap., accordingly, consists of three sections: the first treats of the particular duty of Christians in the state; the second, of their common duty in the same: the third contains the common conclusion of the injunctions concerning morals. The relation or respect of some towards others in the state is twofold, viz:—the one of superiors towards inferiors; the other, of inferiors towards those who are superior to them in any way. The state being distributed, according to this relation, into superiors and inferiors, the apostle distinctly prescribes the duty which inferiors ought to perform towards their superiors; and from this prescribing, it most evidently appears what are also the duties to be performed by superiors towards those who are subject to them in a Christian state. For if I yield obedience to my superior and president, as a power ordained by God; the president himself also, who is superior to me, is bound not to preside, nor to exercise his power over me, beyond what has been appointed him by the Lord. Therefore, as a Christian man sins and violates the Christian duty which he ought to perform, if he does not obey his superior enjoining what is just, and in the Lord; so the superior himself also sins, if he enjoins unjustly, and

not in the Lord: nor is obedience to be rendered to him by the inferior; and that, indeed, "because of conscience," that is, 'lest by yielding obedience to the unjust and ungodly injunction of his superior, he should sin against God, and therefore against conscience.' As, therefore, he must obey his superior, because of conscience, as the apostle says; so, because of conscience, he must refuse obedience to his superior, whenever, in enjoining, he departs from obedience to God, who alone is supreme, and whose will alone is the rule of justice, so that whatever he shall have willed he may enjoin, and whatever he shall have enjoined, ought to be performed by every man. Although, therefore, these relative injunctions are propounded simply, and only to inferiors, yet by analogy, and in due correspondence, they are twofold; just as in Eph. vi. 1-10, the apostle expresses the fifth commandment of the Decalogue, and thence infers these duties also.

1. "Let every soul be subject to the superior powers." "Soul" is here put, by synecdoche, for the compound whole, viz.—'every man whom God has in any way made inferior to another, especially in the state;' so that, the meaning is—'let every man be subject to him whom the Lord may have set over him in the state:' under the name of 'subjection,' again, as a sort of abridgment, all duty whatever, which any inferior owes, in the Lord, to his superior, is included. Accordingly, this is the only injunction expressed in the chap.; and, from it another is, by analogy, to be inferred. The injunction expressed is this—"Let every soul"—'every inferior man'—"be subject"—'perform every duty which he ought to perform in the Lord'—"to the superior powers," that is—'to those whom the Lord has set over him;' and the injunction is general, concerning the duty to be performed to any one who is superior in the state, in whatever degree he may be superior, or by whatever name he may be called, as Peter expounds this passage, (1st Ep. ii. 13, 14.) Here, however, it is deserving of our attention, that the apostle does not say—'superior powerful ones,' but "powers;" whereby he would intimate that the Christian, in the duty of his

obedience, should religiously and wisely distinguish between the '*powerful one*' and '*the power*,' that is, the *office* of the superior, and the *man* himself who holds the office; and that for the three following ends:—1st, That that which ought, according to the ordinance, to be performed to such a *power*, should not be refused to the *superior* himself; 2dly, That the Christian should not surrender himself to be obedient to *the man*, although his superior, beyond what the *power* and the ordinance of God demand; so that his obedience may not be respect of persons (προσωποληψία,) but a duty proceeding from a consciousness of the power having been ordained by God; 3dly, That whenever obedience must be refused because the *powerful one* exceeds the limits of his power ordained by God, that refusal of obedience itself should yet be made with consideration and respectfully, on account of the respect which the Christian is bound to yield to the *power* with which the powerful one—who enjoins beyond the limits of the power committed to him—is invested, and which he bears. "For there is no power," &c. Next come the arguments for the injunction, which are four in number: the first is from the efficient cause, in the remainder of the 1st, and the 2d verse; the second, from the effect of the magistrate, that is, from his work, and the end of his work, in verses 3 and 4; the third, from the necessity imposed, in verse 5; the fourth from the effect of those who are subject themselves, in verse 6. The first argument runs thus:—

'The Christian ought not to resist the ordinance of God, or that which is from God;

'But every power is from God:

'Therefore the Christian ought not to resist the power, but submit himself to it.'

The injunction itself is, indeed, deduced as the conclusion, but in a negative form; for it is the same thing whether you say—'that the Christian should be subject to every power,' or 'that he should resist no power.' As to the other parts of the syllogism, the assumption is first given in the close of verse 1, being established by the cause, viz., the efficient cause, which is—'the ordi-

nance of God;' and by a twofold assertion founded upon that ordinance: the one assertion is propounded under the form of a double negation—"there is no power except from God;" the other simply and absolutely—"the powers which are, are by God;" and to both, the foundation and cause is subjoined, when the apostle says, that they are—"ordained" by God.

2. "Therefore whosoever setteth himself in opposition to the power, resisteth the ordinance of God." We have, in these words, the proposition of the syllogism, including also the conclusion:—'We must not resist the power, because we must not resist the ordinance of God.' "And they that resist bring condemnation upon themselves." This is the establishment of the proposition, from the effect of that resistance whereby any one resists the ordinance of God, which effect is—'condemnation:'—

'Whosoever shall resist the ordinance of God shall bring upon himself condemnation,' that is, 'shall receive condemnation as the reward of his resistance:'

'Therefore the Christian who hopes for salvation, and not condemnation, from God through Jesus Christ, should not resist the ordinance of God.'

Here again, it is worthy of remark, that the apostle does not say 'that those who set themselves in opposition to the *powerful* resist the ordinance of God,' but 'those who set themselves in opposition to the *power*,' thus intimating, that there are cases in which the powerful may be justly resisted. Although, for example, the kingdom of Israel could not have resisted the power of Jeroboam, when once he had been acknowledged as king, they could have resisted him when he forced the calves upon them; for such resistance would not have been resistance to the *power*, but to the *powerful one* abusing his power: they could, nay, not only *could*, with the approbation of God and their own consciences, but even *ought* to have so resisted; and because they did not do this, the people of Israel are every where rebuked by the prophets as guilty of apostacy in the sight of God, inasmuch as they did

not hinder the apostacy, which, although begun by their kings, they both could and ought to have hindered. Such resistance, however, to ungodly superiors who trample upon religion, should not be offered by every one, nor by any private individual, but only by the estates of the realm and its higher members, either all, or at least some of them: the private Israelites, therefore, acted rightly, who, when the whole kingdom complied with their ungodly king in his apostacy, did not resist the king and kingdom, but passed over into the kingdom of Judah (2 Chron. xi. 16), there to worship Jehovah with a good conscience, according to his own law. As, therefore, private individuals are not permitted to resist the magistrate, even when he enjoins what is ungodly, but rather to withdraw, and go to a place where they can serve God with a good conscience; so neither are the estates of the realm and higher members of the kingdom to be condemned, if at any time they have resisted their superior, seeking to make havock of the Church and true worship of God, providing that the arms of that resistance shall have been defensive in opposition to tyranny, not offensive and aimed at a superior. Such, of late years, were the arms of the estates of France, whereby they defended themselves against the king forcing Popery upon them, and persecuting them on account of the pure worship of God. Therefore, although those who resist in this manner, for conscience sake, are wont to be called 'rebels,' and to be proscribed as such by the tyrants who persecute them on account of the worship of God, yet are they neither rebels, nor enemies, but by far the best of subjects, even in relation to the tyrants themselves who persecute them; as clearly appears from the difference between those who thus resist tyrants, and those who are enemies to, or rebels against the *power*, when compared together: for rebels and enemies will not lay down their arms at the desire of the power, even when making just concessions; while those of whom we are speaking would have yielded a most ready obedience to their superiors, had they only granted them permission to serve Jehovah.

Next comes the second argument, which runs thus:—

'Whosoever is the minister of God for good to the Christian, to him the Christian should be subject, or should subject himself;

'But the magistrate,' says the apostle to the Christian, 'is the minister of God to you for your good:

'Therefore you should be subject, and should subject yourself to him of your own accord.'

To this argument the apostle passes on, in this third verse, proleptically, and by anticipating what might be urged as an objection by the Christian; the objection is to this effect:—

'I cannot subject myself to himself who is a terror;

'The magistrate is a terror:

'Therefore I cannot subject myself to the magistrate.'

To this objection the apostle replies, in the beginning of the verse, by making a distinction in the assumption, viz.:—'that it is true the magistrate is a terror to evil deeds, or to those who do evil,' which is the one side of the distinction; the other is—'that to good deeds, or to those who do good, the magistrate is not a terror.' From this the apostle, turning as it were to the Christian, deduces, so to speak, a hypothetical corollary:—there is no reason why you should be afraid of the magistrate, if you do that which is good;' and this he proves by the contrary:—

"If you do that which is good, you shall obtain praise from the magistrate:

'Therefore, if you do that which is good, there is no reason why you should be afraid of the magistrate.'

4. "For he is the minister of God to thee for (thy) good." This is the assumption of the syllogism, or second argument. "But if," &c. From the assumption he deduces, as before, a hypothetical corollary:—'if you do that which is evil, be afraid of the magistrate.' "For he beareth not the sword in vain." We have, in these words, the reason of the corollary, and of the dread which the evil-doer has of the magistrate, from the end of the magistrate's appointment rendered vain:—

'If the evil-doer were not afraid of the magistrate, the magistrate would bear the sword to no purpose and in vain;

'But he does not bear it to no purpose.'

"For he is the minister of God." He next proves this assumption, first, by an argument drawn from the office of the magistrate:—

'He is the minister of God for wrath to him who does what is evil:'

Secondly, by reasoning from the end of his office:—

'God employs the magistrate as his minister, for this end, that he may inflict vengeance on the evil doers:

'Therefore he does not bear the sword in vain.'

5. "Wherefore it is necessary to be subject." This is the third argument whereby the apostle concludes that every soul should subject himself to the superior powers; the argument being taken from the adjunct of its 'necessity:'—

'It is necessary to be subject:

'Therefore every soul ought to subject himself.'

'For that which we are lawfully and honourably urged by necessity to yield, ought to be yielded by us willingly; since therefore we are bound by a lawful and honourable necessity to yield subjection, we ought to subject ourselves to the superior powers of our own accord and willingly.' The assumption alone of this argument is given in the text, being the only thing in the argument to be determined, or concerning which there can be any doubt. "Not only because of wrath." He proceeds to establish the assumption, viz.—'that it is necessary that we should subject ourselves to the magistrate,' by bringing forward the grounds of this honourable and lawful necessity:—

'We must be subject to the magistrates; and the necessity for such subjection is this, that otherwise the magistrate is divinely armed with just wrath against those who are not subject:

'Therefore we ought to subject ourselves to the magistrate, that we may avoid his wrath.'

"But also because of conscience." The second ground is that of 'conscience.' By "conscience" here I understand—'that of sub-

jects in reference to their duty, whereby, according to the 5th commandment of the law, they are bound to subject themselves, and that lovingly, to the superior powers, because of the injunction of Jehovah;' so that this conscience is not given by, nor based upon human laws, but upon a divine command. From this it follows, that subjects are no farther bound to obey the magistrate because of conscience, than in as far as he himself presides and enjoins with a good conscience, and on the authority of the word of God: and besides, it is worthy of observation, that the wrath of the magistrate, unless directed against the disobedient, refusing to do their duty according to the injunction of Jehovah, is neither just, nor lawful, nor to be feared by his subjects, but Christians, in the Christian warfare, must pass through the midst of it to victory in Christ, by the power of the Spirit of God; as we see in the case of Daniel, who rose to victory through the lions' den, with his three friends, who esteemed the wrath of the king as nothing in comparison with their duty to God, although the disobedient were threatened with a fiery furnace, the heat of which had been increased seven times.

6. "On this account also ye pay tribute." This is the fourth and last argument by which the apostle establishes—'that Christians should subject themselves to the magistrate:' it is taken from their effect—'they pay tribute, and that on account of labour and ministry;' for the argument runs thus:—

'To whom you pay tribute for ministry and promoting a common work, to him you should be subject in the doing of that work;

'But you pay tribute to the magistrate for carrying on the common work of governing the state in the Lord:

'Therefore you should willingly and lovingly subject yourselves to him in the doing of that work.'

The assumption only is given in the text; and as both it, and the proposition to which it is subjoined, are self-evident, the apostle, without any further proof, leaves it to themselves to conclude, 'that they should subject themselves, in the Lord, to the supe-

rior powers.' As for what he says, therefore, in the latter part of the verse—that the magistrates are "attending upon this very thing," by "this very thing" he means—'the duty which it devolves upon magistrates to perform, according to the word of God, and in a good conscience;' and that is—'to take care of the state, and to preside over and enjoin upon his subjects, religiously and in the Lord.'

7. "Render therefore to all what ye owe." We come now to the second section of the chapter, which, like the first, contains only one injunction concerning the common duty to be performed by Christians to all who live with them in the state. The injunction is this—'render to all and to every one what you owe.' All who live along with us in the state are either equal to us, or unequal; the unequal being those who are our superiors or inferiors. Hitherto we have had, in this chapter, a particular injunction concerning the latter, according to their particular relation and respect towards each other: the apostle now lays down an injunction concerning both these, and all others who are included in the second branch of the division—viz., our equals—to be performed to all and each, as our fellow-citizens and those who are inhabitants of the same state with ourselves. The injunction refers to universal justice; the substance of it being—'give to every one what is justly his due:' the meaning therefore is this:—'O Christian, whoever you may be, whether superior, inferior, or equal to your fellow-citizens, you are bound to perform to all others who are fellow-citizens with you in the state, and to each according to his rank and degree, this duty—to owe no man any thing.' This duty, the apostle both proves—viz., that it is incumbent upon Christians—and illustrates. The proof is briefly comprised in the illative particle (οὖν) "therefore;" the illustration is subjoined, and the apostle prosecutes it more at length. "Therefore" (οὖν): this illative particle shews that this second injunction of the chapter, which refers to the common duty of Christians, is deduced from the foregoing discussion, or from the relative duty, and particular injunc-

tion concerning the duty of inferiors to superiors; and that, by reasoning from what equally follows in the case of relative opposites, thus:—

'Inferiors should perform the duty which they owe to their superiors; and superiors, in their turn, the duty which they owe to their inferiors:

'Therefore, for an equal reason, equals ought to render to equals, and all to all, the duty which they owe.'

"To whom tribute is due, tribute:" Next comes a twofold illustration of this common injunction. The first is drawn from an induction of the duties which one owes to another; but an incomplete induction, consisting of four particulars only, without peroration. Of these, the three first are borrowed from the foregoing discussion, and contain duties to be performed by inferiors, to their presidents and superiors: for it is the duty of inferiors 'to render tribute.' The same may be said also of—"custom," and "fear:" for it is the part of inferiors to fear their superiors; and wherever this order is inverted, there we see duty inverted and devilish. Thus, in the days of Christ, the ecclesiastical presidents of the Jews would have said—that the baptism of John the Baptist was "of men;" but were withheld from saying it by fear of the people. In like manner, they would have apprehended Christ at the feast of the passover, yet, having assembled the council, they resolved not to do it; and the reason is assigned—"lest there should be a tumult among the people:" they feared, therefore, to seize our Lord openly, because they were afraid for themselves, of the people, who were their inferiors; an inverted fear, which shews that they had forsaken the path of duty: for had they not been "foolish shepherds," whose 'right arm was dried up, and their right eye utterly darkened' (Zech. xi)—that is, had they not departed from duty—instead of their having had to fear the people, the people would have had to be afraid of them. "To whom honour, honour." This is the fourth particular in the induction, and unlike the three preceding: for as the preceding particulars of the induction contained a duty to be performed by all to their superiors; so this

fourth one contains a common duty, to be performed by every Christian to each and all of his fellow Christians. For it is the duty of all to do honour to all, as the apostle teaches us in the 10th verse of the foregoing chap., where he says, concerning all Christians generally, both equal and unequal—"in honour go before one another."

8. "Owe no man any thing." The second illustration is taken from what equally follows in the case of contraries; for to "render" and to "owe" are contraries: the apostle, therefore, illustrates his injunction, thus:—

"Owe no man anything:

"Render therefore to all what ye owe."

An illustration must be drawn from that which is more evident; the apostle, accordingly, takes it as a thing known and evident—'that no one should continue the debtor of another in any duty;' whence he makes plain that which he enjoins, viz.—'that every one should render to another what he owes.' "Except (this) to love one another." This is an epanorthosis and correction of the foregoing prohibition concerning owing no man anything; the epanorthosis being taken from one, and that the most common duty, as we have before shewn on chap. xii. ver. 9—"let love be unfeigned." On account of this common duty of love, he corrects his injunction concerning the prohibition of debt; thus shewing, that 'to love,' in the case of Christians, is a duty of such a kind, that while always and perpetually paid, it is never fully discharged, but remains still to be performed even by those who perform it best, that is, who love others most. One reason for this is the foundation pointed out by the apostle in 1 Cor. xiii. 13, where he says—'that love faileth not, but abideth ever, even when faith and hope shall cease.' "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." This is a second reason for the epanorthosis, in addition to that from 1st Cor. xiii, and is taken from the effect of him who so loves as to be no further a debtor in love. That effect is—'so to fulfil the law, that he who does so is no longer bound to fulfil it;' which is a thing impossible and that cannot be done: for he who has fulfilled

the law even to the utmost perfection, is not thenceforth released from its fulfilment, so as to be no further bound to fulfil it; since the Christian must live lawfully at all times. Hence, therefore, the apostle thus reasons:—

'Whosoever has so loved another, as to be no further bound to love him, has so fulfilled the law, as to be no longer bound to fulfil the law, or to live lawfully;

'But there is no one who has so fulfilled the law, as to be no further bound to live lawfully:

'Therefore, neither has any one so loved another, as to be no longer bound to love him.'

By "the law," in this place, the apostle means—'that concerning the duty to be performed by man to man;' for it is the duty of man towards man which is here the topic of discussion: and this law concerning the duty of man towards man, is that which is comprised in the second table of the decalogue.

9. "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery," &c. He goes on to prove the proposition of the foregoing syllogism, viz.—'that whosoever loveth another hath fulfilled the law, by two arguments. The first is taken from a complete induction, thus:—

'If all the commandments of the second table are comprised in this one commandment—"thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," then it follows, that whosoever so loves his neighbour, as to be no longer bound to love him, has fulfilled the law;

'But the former is true'—as appears from this induction—"Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, &c.; and, if there be any other commandment, (of the second table,) it is briefly comprised in this one saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself:"

'Therefore the latter also is true.'

The proof of the assumption is all that is expressed in the text.

10. "Love worketh no ill to its neighbour." This is the second proof of the assumption, taken from the disparate of such love, which

comprehends the transgression of the whole law concerning the duty of man towards man: that disparate is—'to work ill to one's neighbour;' whence the apostle thus reasons:—

'If love works no ill to its neighbour, then love is the fulfilling of the law;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is also the latter.'

The assumption is contained in the first part of the verse. "Therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." This, which is the second part of the verse, is the conclusion of the last syllogism, and is also the same with the proposition of the first syllogism. Here it is worthy of remark, that the apostle defines 'love' by—"the fulfilling of the law," just as John has defined 'sin' by—"the transgression of the law:" for whether we speak of the law respecting the duty of man towards man, of which the apostle is here speaking, love is the fulfilling of it; or of the law concerning the duty of man towards God, love is the fulfilment of it. As therefore sin is the transgression of the law, and of both its tables; so love is the keeping of both tables of the law: from which it follows, that *sin* and *love* are two things so opposite and contrary, that the one being affirmed, the other is denied; and the one being denied, the other is affirmed.

11. "And that, knowing the season." Next comes the third section of the chap., and general conclusion of the injunctions concerning morals, which have been continued thus far, from the commencement of chap. xii. To this general conclusion, the apostle makes a transition, by the foregoing admonition regarding the perpetual debt of love: for, as has just been proved, every duty to be performed by the Christian towards man, whether in the Church or in the State, is included under 'love,' as a kind of abridgment. The apostle, therefore, in concluding—'that we must always love, or that the duty of love is, as it were, a debt ever to be paid by the Christian to every man, yet never to be fully discharged,' at the same time concludes—'that the Christian should perform every

duty towards every man with whom he lives, whether in the Church and as a member of the Church, or in the State and as a member of the State.' And I am induced to take this view of the passage by the twofold reference of this 11th verse: for in it the apostle proves, at one and the same time, both that which he has chiefly proved, viz.—'that we should owe no man anything, except (this) to love one another,' and that which follows next in order, in verses 12 and 13, namely, the conclusion of his discourse, which is—'that we should cast off the works of darkness.' And this twofold reference of the verses before us is manifest, partly from the first clause of the verse—"and that, having considered the season"—wherein he repeats what has been said at the beginning of verse 8th, viz.—'that we should owe no man anything except (this,) to love one another;' so that the meaning is—'and that I advise,' or 'and this I say, owe no man anything, except to love one another, having considered the season which is now presented—having considered it, namely, yourselves—as I the apostle have considered and observed it;' for the plural participle εἰδότες indicates, that this observation of the season (καιρὸν) is to be referred to the Romans themselves also, to whom he writes, thus—'you, knowing and observing with me the present season, ought to owe no man anything, except to love one another.' This is the first reference of this 11th verse. The second, or that whereby this verse refers to what follows, is manifest from the particle οὖν in the latter part of verse 12; which indicates, that the admonition there given—"let us cast off the works of darkness"—is, as it were, deduced from what precedes, by reasoning from the same observation of the season in the beginning of verse 11: so that the meaning is—'let us, namely, you and me together, cast off the works of darkness.' In this last section of the chapter, therefore, we have, in the first place, in verse 11, and the beginning of verse 12, the argument for the common conclusion, which is also a second argument for the foregoing injunction—"owe no man anything, except to love one another;" in the second place, we have, in the middle of the 12th verse, the common conclusion itself; which is then explained by

being variously amplified in the close of verse 12, and the two last verses of the chap.

"Having considered the season." The common argument, both for what goes before, and for the common conclusion which follows, is taken from the adjunct of the season; whence the apostle thus argues:—

'If it is now time that we should awake from the sleep of sin to love each other always, and to perform every duty to all, both in the Church and in the State, we should now awake from the sleep of sin to every duty, and to love each other always;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is also the latter.'

By "sleep" I understand here—'death in sin,' according to the explanation of this apostle himself, in Ephes. iv. 14; where, after he has quoted from Isaiah the words,—"Awake, thou that sleepest," he subjoins, and that by way of commentary, from the same prophet—"Arise from the dead:" if 'to wake one that sleeps' is 'to raise him again from the dead;' the sleep of those that sleep in sin is itself 'death in sin.' Then by 'awaking' I understand here—that 'repentance' which follows regeneration; for by it, he that sleeps in sin awakes to duty; and he who was dead in sin rises again to love always. "For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed." This is the reason of the preceding assumption, and that whereby he proves that it is now time that we should awake from sleep. The argument of the proof is deduced from the adjunct of 'the nearness' of salvation—"now;" which is set forth and illustrated by a comparison of majority:—"now is our salvation nearer"—that is, 'nearer to us'—"than when we believed." For the understanding of this proof we must expound, in the first place, the time indicated by the adverb—"now;"* then the time at which they are said to have "believed;" and, in the third place, we must enquire what is denoted by the term "salvation." By "now" (νυν) I consider is indicated—'the time of the appearing of the gospel.' By 'the time at which they are said to

* Νυν.

have believed,' I consider is denoted—'the time of the ministration of the law, and the whole period that preceded it, from the first giving of the promise in Paradise;' during all which time they had the gospel, although more obscurely, and also the gospel promises, in which believers trusted, both under the law, and before the law. By "salvation" I understand—'the kingdom of heaven, and the fulfilment of that kingdom in us;' which was both said to be "at hand" at the appearing of the gospel, when that kingdom was clearly revealed, and is to be consummated at the second coming of the Lord. The apostle, therefore, in this verse, reasons in the same way as the Baptist in Matt. iii. 2:—

"The kingdom of heaven is at hand," or is nearer, now that the gospel is coming, than it was in the days of believers under the law, and before the law:

'Therefore, now that the time of the gospel is coming upon you, repent ye,' or, as Paul here speaks, 'it is time that you should awake from sleep and repent.'

My authority for this exposition is the apostle himself, in Gal. iii. 23—"Till faith should come, we were kept under the protection of the law, being shut up unto the faith which was afterwards to be revealed:" where the apostle teaches—'that believers under the law were sustained by the gospel promises, until the clear revelation of the faith,' or 'the manifestation of the kingdom of heaven,' as John speaks, 'should come;' by which 'kingdom of heaven,' or 'clear revelation of faith,' believers in Christ, now under the gospel, are strengthened and preserved unto the complete salvation which is immediately to follow: so that salvation is nearer to us now, than it was to believers, either under the law, or before the law. There is one objection to this exposition, viz., that the apostle is here writing to the Romans, who, being Gentiles, were never under the ministration of the law, and, consequently, could not be said to have then believed. To this I reply, that it is true the apostle is writing to those Romans who had embraced the gospel, most of whom were not Jews, having been brought in from among the Gentiles; but that the apostle here addresses them as no

longer Gentiles, but fellow-citizens of the kingdom of heaven, and members of that one Church which has existed from the very beginning: and that he says to them, as members of the Church—'that salvation, or the kingdom of heaven, is nearer at hand to them than it was to their ancestors in former times;' meaning by 'ancestors,' not the Gentiles from whom they were descended, but believers under the law, and before the law, whose children they were through faith, as the apostle himself affirms, addressing the Galatians, who were Gentiles equally with them—"whosoever are of faith (even Gentiles) are the children of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7).

12. "The night is advanced, and the day is at hand."

By "the night," I understand here—'the time which the Romans had passed as Gentiles, and in ignorance of the true God;' by "the day"—'the time at which, having been fully renewed, they became the children of light, and were illuminated with the true knowledge of God in Christ:' so that the meaning is:—"the night"—that is—'the time of your ignorance'—"is advanced,"—that is, 'is now past altogether, except that, in those who have been born again and illuminated, there still survive some remains of their former ignorance and corruption, not yet completely mortified; and the day of your complete deliverance, both from ignorance and from natural corruption, is now at hand, and will ere long be here.' This is therefore a second argument, whereby the apostle proves—'that it is now time that they should awake from sleep,' from a comparison of dissimilarity between their former condition as Gentiles, and their condition now that they have embraced the gospel; whence the apostle thus reasons:—

'If the time of your ignorance has so gone by, that nothing but the remains of that ignorance is left; and if you have been so illuminated with the knowledge of God in Christ, that the gospel-day has clearly risen upon you, and that the day of your salvation is near—it follows that it is now time for you to awake from the sleep of sin, and to repent;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore, so is also the latter.'

"Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness." This is the common conclusion concerning the duty to be performed by the Christian, both in the Church, and in the State, deduced from the foregoing argument from the season, as is indicated by the particle (οὖν) "therefore," in this way:—

'If it is now time for us to awake from sleep, we ought to cast off the works of darkness, and to live dutifully, as children of light, both in the Church and in the State;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore, so is also the latter.'

The assumption has been previously given; the conclusion is contained in the words last quoted. "And let us put on the habit which befits the light." Next comes the illustration of the common conclusion, from a distribution or enumeration of the parts of this 'casting off,' whereby we cast off the works of darkness; which parts are two in number: the first relates to "habit," or the inward reformation of the mind;' the second, to "walk," *i. e.* 'outward actions,' or 'the regulation of the body.' By "light," I understand here—'the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ,' as opposed to "night," or 'ignorance of God in Christ;' of which the apostle says, in Eph. iv. 18—'that the Gentiles had their understanding so darkened, as to be alienated from the life of God on account of the ignorance that was in them.' The first part, therefore, of this casting off of the works of ignorance, consists in—'acquiring a habit, or inward custom of acting, such as befits the light, or knowledge of God in Christ.'

13. "Let us walk orderly, as in the day." This is the second part of the casting off of the works of darkness, having respect to "walk," or 'outward action:'—'the walk or carriage,' that is, 'every outward action of the body, of us who are Christians, should be ordered by, and conformed to the word of God, and such as befits us in the light and in the day.' "Not in revellings." He again illustrates each part of the preceding illustration by a contrast; but by

hysterosis: for in the first member of the contrast he illustrates an 'orderly walk,' and such as is suited to the day, by an induction of the particulars of a disorderly walk. Six particulars of a disorderly walk, or unbecoming outward action, are enumerated. "Revelling, drunkenness, chamberings," are disorderly actions of the body contrary to the third commandment of the second table —"thou shalt not commit adultery." But "insolence"* is a metaphorical expression, borrowed from the manners of brutes, which insolently oppose themselves to those who make use of them: this is therefore a fourth disorderly outward action of the body, opposed to the first commandment of the second table. "Not in strife and envy." These are the two remaining disorderly actions of the body; which are contrary to the second commandment of the second table: for by "strife," I understand—'every outward contention of the body, and controversy, such as is practised among men;' while "envy" is—'the grudge of one against another, displaying itself in the body, either by gesture or language, or in any other outward manner.'

14. "But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ." This is the second member of the contrast; in which the apostle illustrates that "habit of light," which he has before enjoined (in verse 12) that the Christian should put on. The "habit" here contains two parts, the first of which consists in—'putting on Christ.' "To put on Christ" is—'to be so clothed with Christ, that he may be to us a garment, at once most safe and most glorious;' for the use of a garment is twofold—first, it is a defence to him who puts it on against external injuries from the air; and, secondly, it is a grace and an ornament to the person of him who is clothed with it. When the apostle, therefore, enjoins us to put on Jesus Christ, he sends us back, first of all, to the consideration of ourselves, and to reflect upon our condition by nature, viz., that we are, as it were, 'infants cast out and exposed to injury from many external things,'

* *Protervia* from *protero*, 'to tread under foot;' Gr. ὑβρίζομαι, "brutal insolence." (Passow). (Tr.)

as God taught the ancient Church also, by his prophet Ezekiel, (chap. xvi. 5); and further, that we are 'in disgrace,' as he intimates in the same place: both of which are true of us naturally, and as we are under sin; for the justice and anger of God, and the consequent threatening of the execution of his just anger and judgment, are all against us by nature (τῇ φυσει), from which nothing but dishonour and disgrace can proceed. By this injunction the apostle recommends us, in the second place, to put on Christ, as well against external injuries, as to ward off dishonour; both of which the Lord Jesus Christ effects for all those who put him on. For, in the first place, he has both satisfied the justice, and appeased the anger of God, and subdued our foes, both angels and men, whoever would execute the anger of God upon us—yea, all the judgments which were justly due against us, having been transferred to himself, he has taken out of the way, (Isa. liii. 5); and has thus rendered us safe against the evils that threatened us. Secondly, as he himself is glorious, so he glorifies those who put him on, and will fully glorify them on "that day." This, therefore, is the first part of the habit of light. The second is—'the laying aside of the care of the flesh,' whereby Christians strip themselves, as it were, of the flesh; for to be clothed with Christ and the flesh at the same time is both impossible, and, if it were possible, would neither be safe nor honourable to him who should put them on. He who wishes, therefore, to be clothed with the habit of light, so as to put on Christ for defence and glory, must put off the flesh, as that which brings disgrace, and is accompanied with very many judgments. 'To put off the flesh,' the apostle defines to be—'so to lay aside the care of the flesh, as by no means to desire to fulfil the lusts thereof; nay rather, to strive against the flesh, in order that we may walk in the Spirit:' for 'to fulfil the lusts of the flesh,' is—to "walk after the flesh," (κατὰ σάρκα,) 'to do whatever the flesh desires should be done;' these two, the Spirit and the flesh, being contraries, and coveting contrary things, (Gal. v. 17.) Although, therefore, the remains of the flesh, opposing the Spirit, survive in the children of grace, or

true Christians, as long as they are here, so that, on account of our weakness, we cannot be free from the thoughts and works of the flesh; the apostle nevertheless enjoins us, so to lean to the side of the Spirit, and so to resist the flesh, as at no time to be found fulfilling the lusts of the flesh, or giving ourselves up to the service of sin: because the Spirit is thus provoked to desert us, or at least so to hide himself for a season, that that brief walk according to the flesh, ends in immeasurable sorrow; as we read happened so severely in the case of David.

CHAPTER XIV.

Thus far the apostle has enjoined upon the Christian the duties to be performed by him in the common body; both such as are common to all, and those that are relative, according to the relation, or particular state and condition of those by whom they are to be performed: and as the body in which the Christian lives as a member, is twofold; so the injunctions concerning these duties to be performed in the common body, have been seen set forth in two chapters, viz., xii. and xiii. Next come, in this xiv. chap., injunctions to be performed, not to the body, but to certain persons *approaching* the body, according to their state and condition; these are—"the weak in faith," yet approaching the body of the Church, and living in the same state, or body politic, with ourselves. Consequently, the injunctions which follow in this chapter are in one aspect more common than the preceding, since they are to be performed to those who are members of one and the same Church, as well as state, with ourselves; but, in another view, they are more particular, inasmuch as they are to be performed to those approaching the body, according to the *condition* of those that approach, but not, like the former, to the body, or in the common body, according to *relation*. For 'the weak in faith' are neither the ecclesiastical nor the civil body, but certain mem-

bers of the same state, or civil body, approaching the common body of the Church; and it seems to be the intention of the apostle to intimate this, when he says, in the commencement of the chapter—'that they are to be received;' since 'to be *received*,' is properly a duty performed to those who *approach*. Concerning this duty of receiving the weak, the apostle, in this chapter, and the beginning of the following, lays down three injunctions: the first relates to 'the act of reception itself,' from v. 1 to the latter part of v. 13; the second is about 'not giving cause of offence to the weak brethren whom they receive,' thence to the close of the chapter; the third is in the beginning of chap. xv., where he enjoins us 'to humour those who have been received;' and from the 5th verse of chap. xv. to the 15th verse of the same, he concludes these injunctions touching the duty to be performed to the weak.

1. "Him, moreover, who is weak in faith receive ye." The apostle therefore addresses the strong in faith; whence it follows, that of those who believe on Jesus Christ, some are 'strong,' others "weak in faith:" and in these words the apostle prescribes to both a Christian duty; to 'the strong,' indeed, expressly, but to 'the weak,' analogously and by consequence. The duty of the *strong* is—'to receive the weak,' as Aquila and Priscilla received Apollos at Ephesus, when he knew nothing except the baptism of John (Acts xviii. 26). The duty of the *weak*, on the other hand, is, analogously and by consequence—'to give themselves up to be received by the strong,' that is—'not to refuse, but to acknowledge this duty of reception, as proceeding from God, and extended to them from the mercy of God;' since it would be in vain for any one to receive those who refused reception. I call those 'strong in faith'—'who, as they have embraced the faith of the gospel, so have been taught the liberty in Christ of those who believe,' namely, 'that to the pure all things are pure, and that nothing is impure to him who is pure, unless he considers it to be impure:' for Christ has sanctified all things to believers by a new right in himself;

whence, in 1 Tim. iv. 4, this same apostle says—that "every creature of God is good, and none to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving." This 'strength of faith,' or liberty in Christ, Peter, who was also an apostle of Jesus Christ, is divinely taught whilst yet weak in faith, (Acts x.): for, having been shewn that divine vision concerning things which, under the law, were impure, but now are sanctified, and when, from that weakness of faith, and conscience* of the law, he replies to the command to slay and eat promiscuously, that he cannot do so, because most of the things presented in the divine vision are impure according to the law, and such as, up to this time, through conscience of the law, he has touched, slain, or eaten none of; he is divinely told that all those things which were impure according to the law, are sanctified to believers now under the gospel, so that they may be received with thanksgiving, for lawful use, without any consciousness of impurity. I call "weak in faith," on the other hand—'those who have indeed made a beginning in Christ, but have not yet been taught the way of the Lord fully;' such as was Apollos, when received by Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus. And I call those "weak in faith"—'who, though they have embraced the faith of Christ, have not yet so learned the liberty of believers in Christ, as to prevent their being fettered by a conscience of some former religious bondage, which went before the revelation to them of the doctrine of faith: so, those of the circumcision at Jerusalem who believed, from this same weakness of faith, contended with Peter, as transgressing against duty, because 'he went in to the Gentiles and ate with them' (Acts xi. 2); which contention arose from a conscience of bondage under the law, going before faith, and whereby it was unlawful for Jews, either to eat in common with the Gentiles, or to keep company with them. The apostle sharply rebukes the Galatians for both kinds of weakness: first, because, from this weakness of faith, 'having begun in the Spirit, they desired to be made perfect in the flesh' (Gal. iii. 3), and that contrary to the liberty which believers enjoy in the Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. v. 1); se-

* Conscientious regard for, or scruples about.

condly, because, although they had embraced Christ, such was the effect of their weakness, that Christ was not yet formed in them, so that the apostle says (in chap. iv. ver. 19)—'that he travails again with them, until Christ should be formed in them.'

This is, accordingly, the first injunction in this division, in which the apostle prescribes their duty both to the strong and to the weak in faith: to the former indeed, expressly—'that they should receive the weak in faith, of both kinds;' but to the latter, namely, the weak of either sort, by consequence—'that they should give themselves up to be received by the strong.' 'To receive a weak brother,' moreover, is—'to embrace him as a brother in Christ, notwithstanding his weakness, and to endeavour to remove his weakness by gently instructing him;' as Aquila and Priscilla, having embraced Apollos as a brother, taught him with gentleness the way of the Lord more perfectly. 'To give themselves up to be received,' on the other hand, comprises the two following things: first—'that they should acknowledge, with thanks, the favour of their being so received and embraced as brethren by the strong;' then—'that they should willingly give themselves up to be instructed by the strong, for the removal of their weakness, and supplying the defect which has been in them:' and if, in either of these, the weak shall sin, they are guilty of a violation of Christian duty, and of sinning against that very beginning which they have made in Christ. Hence the apostle at length severely reproves those who do not receive instruction, (Gal. iii. 1); yea, contends against them, (Acts xv. 1); yea, calls them "false brethren," 'messengers of Satan,' 'false apostles,' 'seducers,' (2 Cor. xi. 12; Gal. ii. 4). From this it appears, that those *things indifferent*, in which we are to bear with our weak brethren, are not indifferent *simpliciter* and absolutely, but *secundum quid*, and as regards time; that is, with respect to the weakness of those who believe—concerning whom the expectation is, that they may be strengthened by gentle instruction—and only so long as they suffer themselves to be so instructed: for if they persist in rejecting the duty of the strong in receiving and instructing them, they cease to be weak in faith; and

those very things which formerly were indifferent, at length become heresies, which the strong in faith must oppose. So, after Paul had circumcised Timothy for the sake of the weaker, he opposed circumcision in the case of Titus; the defenders of which, as has been said, he calls 'emissaries of Satan,' and the professors of which he informs, that if they persist in their profession of circumcision, "Christ" offered in the gospel "will profit them nothing" (Gal. v. 2). Hence an answer may be returned to those who, from verses 2 and 5 of this chapter, accuse of an infringement of the duty to be performed towards weak brethren, those who too sharply rebuke and censure the keeping of other feast-days in the Christian Church, besides the Sabbath, the substitution of a hierarchy for ecclesiastical synods, and other things of the same kind, which they themselves haughtily affirm to be indifferent; 'in which,' say they, 'if there be any fault, it is only a sin of weakness, and such that the peace of the Church is not to be disturbed on account of it by too bitterly censuring the weak, but that the individuals themselves who thus err are to be received and embraced as brethren in Christ.' The answer to be returned to these persons is to this effect:—that all that they say is true, so long as the things which they call indifferent, are indifferent, and the brethren whom they call weak, are weak; but if, after these weak brethren have been received, and affectionately taught their weakness from the word of God, they are nevertheless unwilling to forsake the path of weakness—then neither are they themselves any longer weak, but obstinate and heretical; nor are those things which they obstinately defend, and which at first indeed, so long as they themselves were weak, were indifferent, any longer to be regarded as indifferent, but as heresies to be most strenuously opposed by the stronger or more sincere in faith, and the defenders of them to be rejected as false brethren: and in so doing, the stronger neither sin, nor disturb the peace of the Church censuring the weak; but the whole fault in this case lies with the individuals themselves who wish to be considered weak, inasmuch as they obstinately refuse to surrender themselves, either to God, or to the word of God, or

to be received by their brethren gently teaching them from the word of God, which is their duty, as it is that of the stronger to receive them. Thus, Paul rebuked, as heretics in Christianity, those who contended for circumcision (which, nevertheless, he practised himself, for the sake of the weak, in the case of Timothy), and, in so doing, declares that this was the sole ground of his controversy with them—"moreover I, brethren, if I preach circumcision, why do I still suffer persecution?" (Gal. v. 11); as much as to say—'my controversy is not with those who deny the faith, and are the open enemies of Christ, but with hypocrites, who, while they both profess and teach Christ and the faith, yet, in their obstinacy, mix up with the preaching of Christ things which weaken both Christ and the faith of Christ.' And so (Gal. iv. 10, 11) he says concerning those very things indifferent, of which we are now speaking—"Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I fear concerning you, lest I have laboured amongst you in vain (preaching Christ and the gospel.)" "Not (however) to strifes of disputings." This is an epanorthosis of the first injunction, wherein he anticipates those, who indeed receive weak brethren amongst them, but in such a mistaken manner, that that reception is not less an infringement of divinely commanded duty, than if they had not received them; nay more: for to receive a weak brother to strifes of disputings, is a greater hindrance to that weak brother than if he were not received; and consequently the infringement of duty is greater in the former case, than in the latter. "Strifes of disputings." By this expression he intends—'wrangling and contentious disputings, wherein the disputants on both sides so defend their own opinion, and that often without evident reason, as to make it plain that neither party is seeking the truth from the solid foundations of truth, for mutual edification, but each the victory over the other, to the vainglorying of the victor, and disgrace of the vanquished. Such strifes of disputings would be a short method of proceeding, if any one wished to render a weak brother obstinate, and therefore the apostle, as if correcting the words of his own injunction, prohibits the stronger from

such contentions, and charges them not to receive the weak to such strifes, because duty is thus more infringed than it is performed.

2. "One indeed believeth that he may eat every thing." He explains both the foregoing epanorthosis, and the injunction concerning receiving weak brethren, by an induction of examples, which consists of two parts: the first is contained in verses 2, 3, 4; the second in the 5th, and subsequent verses. In the first part he observes the following order: first of all, he proposes an example of a strong brother who should receive, and of one weak in faith who should be received, in verse 2; he then subjoins an injunction to each concerning his duty, in verse 3; in the third place, he adds, at the close of verse 3, and in the 4th verse, an argument for the duty to be performed by the weak. This first example is concerning eating or not eating, 'in which' — the apostle would teach us, as he afterwards teaches in the 17th verse of this very chapter—'the kingdom of God does not consist,' and consequently, that both are in themselves indifferent, and continue to be so as long as any one who is weak in faith eats nothing but herbs: but if, after having been taught his weakness, he does not repent, but obstinately maintains that the kingdom of God consists in not eating, or in eating this, but not that; then this same 'eating and not eating' is no longer indifferent, but a heresy and corruption of the purity of the gospel. This example is borrowed from those Jews who, although they had believed, yet, from a conscience of their worship under the law, thought that it was not lawful to eat every thing, but that it was necessary to obey the prohibition of Moses concerning things that were not to be eaten. These the apostle calls—"weak (in faith)" on account of their ignorance of the liberty of the gospel; and, on the other hand, he calls those—"believers," (πιστοὺς,) or 'strong in faith,' who, having embraced the faith of Christ, firmly believed, that in lawful use, they might lawfully eat every thing, since all things are pure to the pure, for lawful use.

3. "Let not him that eateth, make light of him that eateth not." Next come the injunctions; the first of which is given to the "believing," or 'strong in faith:'—'that they should not make light of, or despise, because of their weakness of faith, those who do not eat.' From this I would have you learn—that the despising of weak brethren, whereby these weak brethren are made light of, is contrary to that reception of the weaker, which he had enjoined upon the stronger, in the first verse; whence it follows, that that reception, as has been already said, consists chiefly in a due regard for our weak brethren. "And let not him that eateth not, condemn him that eateth." This is the second injunction appertaining to the weak; whence it follows, that the injunction laid down in the first verse, although it expressly binds the strong in faith only, yet, analogously and by consequence, relates also to the weak in faith. Moreover, in making the duty of the weak to consist in 'not condemning,' the apostle would teach us:—'that the breach of duty in the weak consists in condemning the stronger; and, consequently, that an arrogant condemnation, without reason, is the ground of their not giving themselves up to be received by the strong in faith, teaching them in gentleness, and from the word.' "For God hath received him." We have next the arguments for the second injunction, and why he that does not eat should not condemn him who eats; from which the apostle wishes to teach us—'that although it be a grievous sin to make light of weak brethren, yet for the weaker to condemn the strong in faith, is a sin more grievous still.' The arguments are two in number. The first is taken from the effect of God:—

'Man should not condemn him who eats, and, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, eats every thing, if God has received him, that is, approved him in Christ apprehended by faith;

'But God has received him who eats everything:

'Therefore the weak in faith, who does not eat every thing, should not condemn him who eats every thing.'

And here I would have you observe, in passing, that although the apostle is reasoning expressly with the weak in faith, for the

performance of duty, yet the argument tacitly binds the strong likewise to perform their duty to the weaker; for if God has received the strong, why should not they also receive the weaker?

4. "Who art thou that condemnest the servant of another?" The second argument is from disparates:—

'No man should condemn the servant of another;

'But he that eats everything is God's servant, and not yours who, from weakness of faith, eat herbs:

'Therefore you who do not eat, should not condemn him who eats.'

"To his own master he standeth or falleth." This is the reason of the proposition, or why the servant of another is not to be condemned:—

'If he stands, he stands to his own master; if he falls, he falls to his own master:

'Therefore it belongs to the servant's own master, either to condemn him falling, or to justify, or establish him standing.'

"But he shall be established." This is an epanorthosis of the preceding disjunctive—"he standeth or falleth;" and not only of it, but also of the conclusion—'it is not for you, therefore, who are weak in faith—to condemn him that eats, even if he deserved condemnation—but for his own master.' The apostle corrects both statements, thus:—'he shall not fall, but shall be established; he shall not be condemned by his own master, but justified.' "For God is able to establish him." This is the reason of the epanorthosis, from the ability of God:—

'God is able to establish him:

'Therefore he shall be established.'

But you will say that the argument from 'being able' to 'being,' is not valid. I answer—that that is true, except when justice demands 'being:' for, if it be granted that any one *ought* to do such a thing, the argument from 'being able' to 'being,' and that he *will* perform that which he is *able* to perform, is valid, if he be just. Although, therefore, God is, and can be a debtor to no crea-

ture, yet—as it is a just thing with him to justify those who firmly believe on Christ Jesus, for the sake of Jesus Christ on whom they believe—that justice is agreeable to the will of God, and has the the testimony of the law and the prophets (c. iii. 21).

5. "One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day (alike.)" This is the second example, or latter part of the induction whereby the injunction given in the first verse, with its epanorthosis about 'not receiving weak brethren to strifes,' are illustrated.

This example, likewise, is borrowed from the law, by the requirements of which the new-moons and various feast days were separated from other days among the ancient people; the remembrance of which so affected even those Jews who had been converted to the faith of Christ, that, in their weakness, almost all who believed retained their zeal for the law and ancient feasts: so James and the elders at Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 20) acknowledge—"thou seest, brother," addressing Paul, "how many thousands of Jews there are who have believed, and they are all zealous of the law." One part of this perverted zeal was—'the esteeming one day above another;' in which, indeed, the believing Jews at length reached such a pitch of obstinacy, that they even urged the keeping of the Jewish feasts upon the Gentiles, as may be seen from Gal. iv. 10—"Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I fear concerning you," &c.:—this, Paul points out to the Galatians; and this evil had crept into that Church through the zeal of those called "Judaizers." As therefore, in the previous example, 'he that eats herbs' is called "weak," so here, the "weak" is 'he that esteems one day above another;' and as, in the former case, he is called "believing," or 'strong in faith,' who, being persuaded of the liberty of Christ, 'knows that it is lawful for him to eat all things,' so, in this verse, he is 'strong in faith' who, being persuaded of Christian liberty, 'esteems every day alike, and gives no preference, on account of the ceremonies of the law, to one day over another.' "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind." This is an admonition

given by the apostle to both parties in common; both to him who esteems one day above another, and to him who esteems every day alike: the admonition is this:—'that every one of either party should act according to his measure of faith; and in such a way, that what he does shall be what he believes to be pleasing to God.'

By this admonition, the apostle shews both those who esteem, and those who do not esteem the day, how very near they are to evil, unless they take heed to themselves. For if those who esteem one day above another, have been taught the liberty which is in Christ, they can no longer esteem one day above another, in the Lord, and with assurance of faith; because they are adverse to known truth, and so are no longer weak believers, but opposers of known faith and unbelievers: the apostle therefore admonishes such, that so long as they esteem one day above another, they should examine the strength of their faith, lest acting against light and faith, they be found unbelievers, and obstinate in a lie. In like manner, he admonishes the strong, not to found their liberty on implicit faith, or the authority of others, so as to have no assurance of their liberty in themselves: for in this way, even *they* will not be strong, but weak, yea, acting amiss; since they do what they do, without faith or assurance in themselves. The apostle therefore wishes, that both the strong and the weak should do what they do, according to their measure of faith, and in such a way, that neither he who esteems one day above another, should do so any longer, than until such time as he may be taught the liberty of Christ, and that every day is to be esteemed alike; nor he who esteems every day alike, should so esteem it, unless, having been taught the liberty of Christ, he be sure in his own mind, that in esteeming every day alike, he is acting rightly: whence it most clearly appears, that in the judgment of the apostle, whoever believes, whether he be strong or weak in faith, should have assurance, and be fully persuaded concerning that which he believes. From this it is manifest, that if the advocates of Popery would take their stand upon the divine testimony, the controversy betwixt the Papists and the Church of Christ concerning the assur-

ance of justifying faith, or the persuasion of grace, might be brought to a termination; but from this passage, and a great many others similar to it, the Church of Christ asserts that assurance, in opposition to the Papists.

6. "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it to the Lord." This is a prolepsis, or anticipation of an objection to the foregoing admonition. Some might say:—'that in controversies concerning religion, it is impossible for both the opposing parties to be sure that they are pleasing God, the one in doing, and the other in not doing: this, therefore, being impossible, that it is of no use to admonish both him that eats, and him that does not eat, him that observes the day, and him that does not observe it, to be sure, each in his own mind, that is, persuaded by faith, that he is acting rightly, and pleasing God—the one in eating, the other in not eating; the one in esteeming one day above another, and the other in esteeming every day alike.' To this objection the apostle, in the verse before us, replies:—'that the antecedent of the argument is false; and that so long as the things remain indifferent, and he who believes continues weak in faith, even he who believes in weakness may have assurance concerning that which he believes, just as he who is strong in faith, and in regard to whom it is most evident that he has such assurance;' and he establishes his reply, in this verse, by two arguments. The first is borrowed from the end:—

'He who does not eat, and esteems one day above another, from weakness of faith, as well as he who eats, and esteems every day alike, because he is strong in faith, does or omits, whatever he does or omits, to the Lord, that is, so that the Lord may be glorified in his doing or omitting.'

The second argument is borrowed from the effect of assurance of faith, both in him who regards, and in him who does not regard, in him who does not eat, as well as in him who eats; which effect is—'the giving of thanks:'—

'In regarding or eating, he who does, as well as he who omits, gives thanks to God concerning his deed or omission:

'Therefore each is sure in himself, that he is pleasing and serving God, whether in doing or omitting.'

7. "For none of us liveth to himself." By "us," he means here—'us who believe,' whether we be strong or weak in faith; and consequently, "none of us" is here equivalent to—'none of us who believe:' in this verse therefore he proves, from the genus itself, the end from which he has just reasoned. The argument of the proof runs thus:—

'Whoever lives to the Lord, does or omits to the Lord, whatever, in living, he does or omits;

'But all we who believe live to God:

'Therefore we who believe, whether we eat or do not eat, whether we regard the day or do not regard it, do it or omit it, to the Lord, or in order that the Lord may be magnified.'

This 7th verse contains an illustration of the assumption, taken from the contrary end:—

'None of us who believe lives to himself, that is, in order that he himself may be glorified, or that he may serve himself:

'Therefore, all of us who believe live unto God.'

'To live to God,' and 'to live to one's self,' are contrary opposites: for whether a man lives to sin, or to Satan in sin, or to his own pleasures, or to covetousness, (each of which is found in the Scriptures,) they are all summed up in one, when he is said—'to live to himself;' since whatever a man lives to, who does not live to the Lord, he is deceived by appearances, and is induced so to live, because, under this pretext, he lives to himself, that is, to his own advantage and glory. 'To live to one's self,' therefore, and 'to live to God,' are here opposed to each other by the apostle, as two contraries. "And none dieth to himself." He next explains the contrary state, by what equally follows in the case of privative opposites:—

'None of us who believe dies to himself:

'Therefore,' by parity of reasoning, 'none lives to himself:' unless you prefer to say, that as the apostle illustrates state by

state, or 'standing to the Lord' by 'living to the Lord;' so he illustrates privation by privation, or 'falling to the Lord,' (τὸ πίπτειν Κυρίῳ,) 'by dying to the Lord,' (τὸ Κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκειν.)

8. "For whether we live, we live unto the Lord, or die, we die unto the Lord." This is the assumption itself, amplified by what equally follows in the case of privative opposites, just as the illustration of it in the previous verse was taken from the contrary. Moreover, 'to live to the Lord,' is—'so to live,' and 'to die (ἀποθνήσκειν) to the Lord,' is—'so to die, as that the Lord may be glorified, and the honour of his name may be present to our minds, both in our life, and in our death.' "Whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. This is an inference, or ulterior conclusion, instead of the proper conclusion of the foregoing syllogism. The proper conclusion of the foregoing syllogism is—'therefore, he who eats or does not eat, he who esteems the day or esteems it not, whatever he does or omits, in living, does it to the Lord.' From this the apostle infers, as an ulterior conclusion—'that in life, and in death, we are the Lord's,' that is, 'to be judged by him alone, and not by one another, nor by ourselves;' because, as no man lives either to himself or to another, or dies either to himself or to another, so no man is either his own or another's, but the Lord's alone: for we are his to whom we live, to whom we die, and whom we serve, and to be judged in our life, death, and service, by him only; as the apostle teaches us in 1st Cor. iv. 3, 4.

5. "For Christ both died and rose again, and revived for this end." The apostle goes on to prove the preceding inference, viz., —'that whether falling or standing, living or dying, we are the Lord's,' by a new argument, taken from the end of the death, resurrection, and subsequent eternal life of Jesus Christ:—

'Christ both died, and after death rose again, and since his resurrection lives for ever, for the end, that he might be Lord at once of the dead, and of the living:

'Therefore he is Lord of all, and all are his servants, in life and in death.'

By "the living," I understand here, as above—'believers,' the end of whose life is the glory and honour of God. The apostle seems also to use the term "death" here, in a wider acceptation, extending it not only to believers in death, but also to the spiritually dead and dying; of whom the apostle says, that 'they die to the Lord,' inasmuch as it is the Lord, and none else, from whom those who die spiritually fall away in their death, and consequently, by whom alone, as sinning against him only in so dying, they are to be judged.

10. Thus far, from the 4th verse, the apostle has interdicted any one in the Church from judging or condemning another, by an argument drawn from the right of Jesus Christ alone, who is Lord of all, and whose servants we all are, and, consequently, whose prerogative alone it is to judge all, to condemn those who are to be condemned, and to justify those who are to be justified. He now proceeds in this, and the following vv. as far as the latter part of ver. 13, to interdict the same by an argument drawn from ourselves, and that twofold. The first argument is taken from this—'that we are all to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ the judge, none of us before the judgment-seat of another;' and the apostle thus reasons:—

'If we are all to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ the judge, none of us, as judge, should either condemn or make light of his brother;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore, so is the latter.'

"But thou, why dost thou condemn thy brother? or even thou, why dost thou make light of thy brother?" This is the conclusion of the syllogism, adorned with a rhetorical interrogation, whereby the apostle extorts from all who believe, the confession—'that none should condemn, and none despise his brother.' "For we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ." This is the assumption of the syllogism.

11. "For it is written, I live, saith the Lord." He further establishes the assumption by the testimony of the Holy Spirit, announced by Isaiah, (chap. xlv. ver. 23). The 'bowing of the knee' betokens—'the subjection of him who bows the knee, due to him to whom he bows it;' and 'the confession of the mouth'—'the acknowledgment by him, who bows the knee, of that subjection.' By this testimony of the prophet, therefore, he teaches these two things:—(1.) 'that all are to be subjected to Christ the judge; (2.) that all, even the most ungodly themselves, shall be forced to acknowledge that subjection to be just and legitimate.

12. The second argument is taken from ourselves, or from the account which each of us shall give to the judge, for himself, when we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ; and the apostle thus reasons:—

'Whosoever is to give an account of himself when he stands before the judgment-seat, should not judge another before the time, but should be solicitous, in time, how he shall answer concerning himself;

'But we are all, every one of us, to give an account of ourselves when we stand before the judgment-seat of Christ:

'Therefore, none of us should judge another before the time, but every one should rather be solicitous, in time, how he shall answer to the judge concerning himself.'

"So then, every one of us shall give an account of himself to God." This is the assumption of the syllogism.

13. "Let us no longer, therefore, judge one another"—is the conclusion. Thus far the injunction concerning the 'reception of weak brethren.' Next comes the second, about—'not putting a cause of offence in the way of those who have been received;' which is illustrated by a finite * effect, and amplified by a rhetorical correction illustrated by a comparison of majority. "But" is the note of correction and contrast; "rather"—the note of the comparison

* *i. e.*, having a (definite) end.

whereby the correction is amplified; "exercise judgment"—the finite effect whereby he illustrates the injunction; "that"—the note of the end of the finite effect. "Ye may not put a stumbling-block, or cause of offence, in a brother's way"—is the proposition of the injunction; wherein the apostle makes use of two terms to express that from which he prohibits the stronger in the Church: the first of these, προσκομμα, denotes—'that on which the feet of those walking on a journey stumble, so that it is a hindrance to their progress on their journey;' while "cause of offence," on the other hand, has more a reference to the mind. The import, therefore, of the injunction which the apostle here gives to the stronger, is this:—'that they should not put an obstacle or hindrance in the way either of the inward or outward actions of their weaker brethren, while they are advancing in the path of salvation.' They put an obstacle in the way of the inward actions [of their brethren] by inspiring doubt; and of their outward actions, when they induce them, by their example, to do what they otherwise would not do, or to omit what they otherwise would not omit; each of which, the apostle pronounces evil, or a sin, as being done without faith. The apostle is not content with simply propounding this injunction; but to shew the difficulty of obedience, he says —'that we must *exercise judgment* for this end, that we may not put a stumbling-block in the way either of the mind or outward actions of a weak brother; and that that judgment of ours is to be exercised in this, rather than in judging others, whether stronger or weaker.'

14. "I know and am persuaded." He explains, proleptically, 'the judgment' which he has said we are to exercise for this end, that we may not give cause of offence to a weak brother; and the prolepsis consists of two parts. The first prolepsis is this:—the stronger might say—'that they had been taught by the liberty of the gospel, that nothing is impure in lawful use; and, consequently, that they ought to follow the doctrine of Christian liberty in eating all things, only using them religiously, and not to stop or

cease from the lawful use of things, on account of the ignorance or weakness of another on that point.' The apostle replies to the antecedent of this objection by a distinction—"that nothing is impure in itself," that is, 'in lawful use;' which member of the distinction the apostle amplifies by the adjuncts of his own knowledge and persuasion, and the efficient cause of both:—'*I know* that nothing is impure in itself, and *I am persuaded* of it; and the efficient cause of both this knowledge and persuasion of mine is Jesus Christ, who has procured for me a right to all things, so that all things are clean for lawful use.' "But to him who esteemeth any thing to be impure, to him it is impure." This is the second member of the distinction:—'some things, however, are impure for use *secundum quid*, with respect to the state of the weak; and incidentally, on account of the opinion of him who considers them impure: for to him who considers any thing impure, his very opinion of it renders it impure; not *simpliciter*, but because he himself regards it as impure.'

15. "But if, on account of food, thy brother is grieved, now walkest thou not lovingly." This is the second prolepsis; the strong might say:—'if it be true that nothing is impure in itself, but only incidentally and with respect to the opinion of the weaker, the whole fault lies with the weak, and none with me, who, using my Christian liberty, eat all things as pure.' To this objection also, as to the former, the apostle replies by a distinction, namely:—'that the fault indeed lies with the weak, but in such a way, that there is some also in the free use of things pure, viz., that while using their liberty, they grieve the weak: for, having no respect in this matter to their weakness, they offend against the common law of love, which commands us to love our neighbours as ourselves; in which love, if the strong do not walk, they grieve their weak brethren by abusing their liberty.' "Destroy not him by thy meat for whom Christ died." Thus far the explanation of the judgment; now come the arguments by which the injunction is established. The first argument is taken from the effect of giv-

ing cause of offence to weak brethren; which effect is—'their destruction.' The apostle, therefore, here reasons thus:—

'If any one is not to be destroyed by meat, we must not, by eating every thing, put a cause of offence in his way;

'But a weak brother is not to be destroyed by meat:

'Therefore we must not put a cause of offence in his way by eating every thing.'

The assumption is given in the text, being proved by the adjunct of the price of the redemption of the weaker:—

'Christ died for our weak brethren:

'Therefore a weak brother is not to be destroyed by so worthless a thing as meat.'

16. "Let not therefore your good be evil spoken of." The second argument is taken from the end of not putting a cause of offence in the way of weak brethren:—'we must not put a cause of offence in the way of our weak brethren, in order that our good may not be evil spoken of.' By "our good" he means—'the benefit of Christian liberty:' 'we are freely to use our Christian liberty in such a way, that the benefit of that liberty may not be evil spoken of by our free use of the same.' Hence the apostle thus reasons:—

'We must not, by the use of our Christian liberty, expose the benefit of that liberty to evil-speaking;

'But the benefit of Christian liberty is exposed to evil-speaking, when, in the use of that liberty, we put a stumbling-block in the way of our weak brethren:

'Therefore we must not put a stumbling-block in the way of a weak brother by the use of our Christian liberty.'

The proposition is given in the text.

17. "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink." By "the kingdom of God" I understand here—'the service of God, wherewith the Godly serve him, and whereby it becomes manifest that he reigns in them as their King.' This is, accordingly, a third

argument for the injunction, from the subject-matter of the kingdom of God, set forth proleptically, and by contrast: for the strong might say:—'we must hold fast the liberty of the kingdom of God, whatever be the consequence; nor are we to be stopped by the destruction of any, or by our good being evil spoken of, but must consider what the liberty of the kingdom of God demands, so that God, our Lord and King, may be glorified in the use of our liberty.' To this objection the apostle replies by arsis and thesis, shewing:—'that the kingdom of God does not consist in the things in question, viz., in meat, drink, and other things indifferent,' that is, 'that the service of God is neither attended to by attention to these things, nor neglected by the neglect of these things, considered in themselves; but that the service of God, whereby it becomes known that God is our King, and we his kingdom, consists in righteousness, peace, and the joy of the Spirit.' By "righteousness" I understand—both 'imputed' and 'inherent righteousness:' for we serve God, and God reigns in us, through faith, by which we lay hold of God's righteousness—that is, righteousness imputed through faith in Christ—unto salvation; and new obedience, whereby we grow daily in inherent righteousness, as the effect of righteousness imputed, until we be also perfected, and completely renewed after the image of God. By "peace" I understand—'that serenity of a pacified conscience which flows from the imputation of Christ's righteousness;' and I further understand by the term "peace" here—'the desire, as far as in us lies, of being at peace with all men.' The "joy of the Spirit" is the effect of both, viz., of the "righteousness" and the "peace." And the kingdom of God is said 'to consist in' these things, because it is from these things that it becomes known that God is our King, and we his redeemed. Such is the way in which the apostle replies to the prolepsis. The argument hence drawn for the establishment of the injunction, is as follows:—

'If the kingdom of God, or that service whereby it becomes known that God reigns in us, does not consist in meat, food and drink, and other things indifferent, these things indifferent are

either to be used or omitted for the purpose of gaining over the weak to God;

'But the former is true—the service of our God does not consist in these things:

'Therefore they are to be used or omitted for gaining over weak brethren to God.'

The assumption is given in the text. "But righteousness, and peace, and joy through the Holy Spirit." He illustrates the assumption by a contrast, consisting of three parts, in which he says that the spiritual service of God, or that which is in spirit and in truth, consists; and that service he also illustrates here by its efficient cause—"the Holy Spirit," through whom it is that we have righteousness, and peace, and joy: for as Christ has procured these for us by his blood; so it is the Holy Spirit that seals righteousness in us by faith, and works peace in us through righteousness, and joy through both. Since these three things, 'righteousness, peace, and joy,' are increased within us, not by the rigid use of our Christian liberty, but rather by accommodating ourselves to the edification of our weak brethren in the free use or omission of those things in which, through Jesus Christ, we are free; the apostle wishes us not to put a cause of offence in the way of the weak, by rigidly exercising our liberty: and in this he has himself set us an example, (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21, 22).

18. "For he that by these things serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and approved of men." He proves the latter member of the contrast, or—'that the spiritual service of God consists in righteousness, peace, and joy, through the Spirit, from the twofold adjunct [of that service], thus:—

'He that serves God by laying hold of the righteousness of Christ, and living righteously, having peace of conscience and the joy of the Spirit, is both acceptable to God, and approved of men;

'Therefore the spiritual service of the kingdom consists in righteousness, peace, and joy through the Spirit.'

The apostle does not, however, here claim merit for man, either

from God or from men; for as regards God, imputed righteousness alone works acceptance with him. By "men" I understand here—'the Church of God,' which, being endued with the Spirit, is both able to discern, and does discern, spiritual things, and through the Spirit acknowledges that all things are rightly done, and omitted, which are freely done or omitted for the edification of even the weakest members in the Church: unless you prefer, by the term "men," to understand—'men in general,' whether in the Church or out of the Church, in whom it is innate, and to whom it is given by the remains of a common disposition in our nature, to esteem the peaceful more highly than those who are the occasion of offence, or stumbling, to others.

19. "So then, let us follow the things which tend to peace, and the things which tend to mutual edification." By "peace" he means—'the friendly intercourse, in Christ, of the strong with the weak, and the weak with the strong;' and by "mutual edification"—'the forbearance and instruction, in Christ, both of the strong and of the weak.' This is, accordingly, a fourth argument for the second injunction, taken from the subject of Christian duty, which is also the disparate of stumbling and offence, thus:—

'The Christian must follow and do the things which tend to peace and mutual edification;

'But to put an occasion of stumbling in the way of a weak brother, in the rigid use of Christian liberty, does not tend to peace and mutual edification, but puts a cause of offence in the way of a weak brother:

'Therefore,' &c.

20. "Destroy not, for the sake of food, the work of God." By "the work of God," I understand here—'the beginning of the good work in Jesus Christ which God works in weak brethren;' concerning which the apostle recommends to the strong, not to destroy that work of God, by inciting the weak to do things which to themselves appear evil, and, consequently, to fall back from that

beginning of the good work: this is accordingly a fifth argument for the injunction concerning cause of offence:—

'We must not do that whereby the work of God in a weak brother is destroyed, and the weak brother himself caused to fall back from the beginning which he has made in Jesus Christ;

'But to put a cause of offence in his way by the free use of food, drink, and the like, is to destroy the work of God in him, and to cause him to fall back from the beginning which he has made in Jesus Christ:

'Therefore, we must not put a cause of offence in his way, by that free use of things indifferent.'

"All things indeed are pure; but it is evil for the man who eateth with occasion of stumbling." This is a prolepsis, whereby the apostle refutes an instance against the foregoing assumption:— 'All things,' he who is strong might say, 'are pure to me for lawful use; therefore, although he who is weak may stumble, I do not destroy the work of God in him by my liberty, since, using pure things purely, I do well.' The apostle replies by a distinction:— 'I admit the genus, and that all things are pure, and all things lawful to you; yet in another respect they are not lawful, inasmuch as there is evil in your eating and use of your liberty, on account of the adjunct of your causing a weak brother to offend: therefore that which, absolutely and simply, is to do well, becomes sin to you, if you do it to the stumbling of a weak brother.' This, accordingly, is the same thing which the apostle elsewhere says of himself (1 Cor. vi. 12).

21. "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor (to do any thing)." He next proves the foregoing reply, viz.—'that to eat all things, although, absolutely and in itself, pure and lawful, yet, incidentally and when attended with occasion of stumbling, is evil;' this reply, I say, he proves by what equally follows in the case of contradictories, thus:—

'Not to eat, not to drink, not to do any thing,' whereby a brother stumbles, is offended, or is made weak, is good:

'Therefore, to eat that whereby a brother stumbles, incidentally, at least, and with respect to his stumbling, is evil.'

The antecedent is given in this verse, in which the three contradictories—"not to eat," "not to drink," "not to do," are each illustrated by their subjects; the subject of 'not eating,' being—"flesh;" of 'not drinking,'—"wine," and of 'not doing,'—"anything." "Whereby thy brother stumbleth," &c. In this, the remaining part of the antecedent, the apostle expresses the cause of offence put in the way of weak brethren, by a striking gradation from the less: 'to stumble' being the least; 'to be offended,' greater; and 'to be made weak,' among the greatest. For "to stumble" is—'to fall by imitating the example of another,' or 'to do anything without faith, and the consciousness of doing well, which, nevertheless, would be well done, if faith, and therefore conscience, were strong.' "To be offended," again, is—'to be inwardly grieved on account of that fall, which would yet be no fall, if faith were strong, and conscience free.' Lastly, "to be made weak" is—'for faith itself, previously weak, and conscience, incidentally defiled, to lose strength by degrees; so that, unless help arrive from God, they at length become altogether extinct.' Or you may choose rather to refer these three things to different objects, and to consider the weak as stumbling at his own deed, viz., what he does in imitation of the example of the stronger; as offended by the deed of the stronger; and as contracting weakness of faith from both.

22. "Thou hast faith." This is the conclusion of the second injunction, embellished with a rhetorical concession and epanorthosis: —'I willingly grant you, that you have faith; nevertheless, have it to yourself, and before God, not openly, to the stumbling of your brethren.' The term "faith," is here used for—'the full persuasion (πληροφορία) of Christian liberty;' so that the meaning of the apostle is the following:—'of this my injunction, whereby I enjoin you to exercise judgment for this end, that you may not put a cause of offence in the way of a weak brother by your deed, the sum and conclusion is this, that I grant and acknowledge to you,

that you have the persuasion of Christian liberty; yet, let it be enough for you to have that persuasion before God, that is, to be thereby approved before God in the use of your liberty, and take care not to make a boast and a display of that persuasion, to the stumbling of those who have it not.' "Happy," &c. The apostle establishes the conclusion which he has deduced, especially the latter part of it, or the epanorthosis, whereby he has admonished the strong to have his persuasion of Christian liberty to himself before God, and not to make a display of it to the stumbling of the weak—this conclusion, I say, he establishes by two arguments. Of these, the first is taken from a common and universally admitted maxim, which is this—"Happy is he that condemneth not himself, in that whereof he approveth;" which the apostle thus accommodates to the stronger in faith:—

'If you make a display of your Christian liberty to the stumbling of the weaker, you condemn yourselves in that of which you rightly approve:

'Therefore, do not make a display of it, so as to cause your weaker brethren to stumble, but have it to yourselves before God.'

The proof of the antecedent is from the foregoing discussion, in which the apostle has granted that all things are pure, and all things lawful (whence it follows that he has rightly approved of Christian liberty); yet that, incidentally, there is sin in eating, if one should eat with an occasion of stumbling to the weak; from which it follows, that if any sinned against weak brethren by the use of their liberty, they would condemn themselves by that very liberty of which they rightly approved.

23. "But he that doubteth," &c. The second argument is from the injury of a weak brother:—

'If, while you make a display, a weak brother shall eat in imitation of your example, that weak brother is condemned for eating:

'Therefore do not make a display of your persuasion before the weak, so as to lead them to imitate your example without that persuasion.'

"Because he eateth not from faith." The antecedent is here proved:—'because he does not eat, as you eat, with the persuasion that he is doing right.' "And whatsoever is not from faith is sin." This is the reason of the consequence; which, along with the preceding clauses of the verse, constitute a complete syllogism thus:—

'Whatever is not from faith is sin, and he who does it is condemned for doing it;

'But he that eats, doubting, does not eat from faith;

'Therefore, if any one eats, doubting, he sins, and is condemned.'

In both these arguments you are to understand this 'condemnation,' not of—'the casting away of the reprobate by God,' but of—'the condemnation of the conscience from the commission of sin:' so that the import of that first general maxim is—'that he is happy who does not contract a bad conscience to himself, in that which he knows to be rightly done;' and in the second argument, the import of the conclusion is—'that he who eats, doubting, contracts a bad conscience to himself, because he sins in eating.'

CHAPTER XV.

We have next, in the first four verses of this chapter, the third and last injunction given to the strong, concerning their duty towards the weak; for which the apostle brings forward two arguments: the first from the adjunct of debt, in the 1st verse; and the second from the example of Christ, in the 3d verse; betwixt these comes in the conclusion, in verse 2; and in the 4th verse, he meets an objection arising out of the proof of the second argument.

1. "Moreover, we that are strong ought," &c. This is the first argument, which is to the following effect:—

'The strong ought to apply themselves, and to do their utmost to perform that which they are bound to do by debt, on account of the benefit of strength which has been conferred upon them;

'But we who are strong ought to bear the weaknesses of the weak, that is, we are bound by duty, and as it were by debt, on account of the benefit of strength conferred upon us, not only to bear with the weak, but even to help them in bearing the burden of their infirmities:

Therefore, we who are strong ought to apply ourselves, and do our utmost to perform this.'

The assumption is contained in the beginning of the first verse. "And not to humour ourselves." This is an illustration of the assumption from the contrary:—'it is not the duty of the strong to please themselves, or to humour themselves because of their strength;' where, observe, that these two things—'to bear the infirmities of the weak,' and 'to please ourselves,' are put in opposition after the manner of contraries: for 'to please ourselves,' and 'to bear the weaknesses of the weak,' are things inconsistent with each other; so inconsistent, indeed, that they cannot co-exist in the same subject, nor can he be a Christian, who humours himself, and does not bear the infirmities of his weak brethren.

2. "Therefore every one of us ought to please his neighbour." This is the conclusion of the first argument, but so enunciated as to stir up the weak, to check the strong, and to teach both that they are bound to please one another; having respect, however, chiefly to the strong, as being in greater danger of pleasing themselves, on account of their strength, than those who are conscious of their weakness: so that the meaning is—'whether we be strong or weak, we ought to be prepared, not to please ourselves, but each other mutually; and especially the strong to please the weaker.' This conclusion is therefore directly opposed to the evil which he here censures, namely—'that he who eats every thing should despise him who does not eat;' and is of the same import with the proposition in the 3d verse of chap. xiv.—

"let not him that eateth, make light of him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, condemn him that eateth." "For his good." This is an epanorthosis of the conclusion:—'Christians ought to be zealous to please one another; not however in every thing, but only in those things which are for the good of those whom they please.' "To edification." This is a definition of the "good" which ought to be present to the minds of Christians in pleasing others; it is—"good to edification," *i. e.*, 'to the edification in Christ of those whom we please.' From this the apostle would have us to observe, in passing, that nothing is a benefit to the Christian, nor can any good be conferred upon him, if he is not thereby edified in Christ; for these two things—'to be good for the Christian,' and 'to serve to his edification in Christ,' are here set forth by the apostle as co-extensive and reciprocal: whatever good happens to the Christian is his edification in Christ; whence the apostle would infer and conclude, in the second place —'that nothing is good for the Christian, which is not subservient to his edification in Christ.'

3. "For Christ indeed pleased not himself." This is the second argument for the foregoing conclusion, from the example of Jesus Christ:—

'We ought to conduct ourselves in the same manner towards each other, as Jesus Christ conducted himself towards us;

'But he did not please himself, but carried our burdens alone;

'Therefore we ought to bear one another's burdens, and not to please ourselves.'

The assumption is given in the commencement of this third verse. "As it is written." This is the establishment of the assumption from the testimony of scripture. The written testimony is adduced from Psalm lxix. 10 (9); where, after David, as the type of the Son of God, had professed his zeal towards the house of God, he complains that the reproaches of those who reproached God fell upon him, and that he himself was reproached, through his zeal for God's house, by those who despised God's

house, and reproached God: this scripture therefore testifies, that first David, typically, and afterwards Christ, properly, did not please himself, but endured all the blasphemies of the ungodly, or of an ungodly world, despising God's house, and reproaching God.

4. "For the things which were written." This is a prolepsis, whereby the apostle anticipates what he foresaw *might* be objected, and *would* be objected by his opponents against the scripture just quoted. 'Let it be granted,' the opponents might say, 'that that scripture which David originally uttered concerning himself, is properly to be understood of Christ; yet that scripture will not prove that Christ did that, which from his example you conclude that we should do—namely, that he bore the weakness of weak brethren, so that we who are strong ought to do the same, after his example—but that, through zeal for his Father's house, he endured the reproaches of a wicked world, despising God and God's house: wherefore it does not follow from that act, although the act not merely of David, but of Jesus Christ, that we ought to humour our weak brethren, or to bear their weaknesses; but rather to please ourselves in the free use of our Christian liberty.' To this objection the apostle replies:—'that although the subject is changed, and it is true that, according to that scripture, Jesus Christ endured the reproaches of a wicked world, despising God and God's house; yet the force of the argument remains, and it rightly follows from the example of Jesus Christ not pleasing himself, but enduring reproaches on account of God and God's house, that we ought to bear the weaknesses of our weak brethren, and not to please ourselves:' and he proves his reply from the end of the scripture quoted, as well as of all those things which were written aforetime concerning Jesus Christ; namely this—'that they were written for our instruction, and that we might become wise in a holy manner, after Christ's example.' Moreover the apostle seems, by this quotation of scripture, although apparently foreign to the purpose, to have taken occasion for a further argument: for if Jesus Christ, through zeal for his Father's house, which was out-

ward and material, patiently endured the reproaches of a wicked world; so, much more should we, through zeal for the salvation of our weak brethren, who are God's spiritual building, bear with their infirmities, and as Christ pleased not himself, so should we not please ourselves. "That through endurance." The apostle explains the foregoing end, or 'the wisdom which we should learn from those things which were written aforetime concerning Jesus Christ,' by its parts, and more remote end. The parts are two in number. The first is—"endurance," or 'that holy patience whereby we are to bear not only with our brethren, for their edification; but also with a wicked world, lest we become wicked with the wicked, and be overcome by their evil,' as the apostle has before admonished us (c. xii. 21): for Christians 'have need of endurance,' as the same apostle teaches (Heb. x. 36), 'that, obeying the will of God, they may receive the promise.' "And comfort of the scriptures." The second part of the wisdom to be learned from those things which were written aforetime concerning Jesus Christ, is—"comfort," or "the joy of the Spirit even in the midst of sufferings,' concerning which the apostle has before said (c. v. 3)—"we even glory in tribulations." This is here set forth as a part of Christian wisdom ulterior to endurance; for we first suffer holily, and then glory holily in our sufferings: and these are said to be parts of Christian wisdom, because there is no man who knows either how to suffer holily, or to rejoice holily in his sufferings, except he who is truly a Christian, and has learned of Christ. This "comfort" is said to be—"comfort of the scriptures," for two reasons: first, because, as the apostle has said in the beginning of the verse, it is learned from all the things written aforetime concerning Christ; and secondly, because true and solid comfort is nowhere to be found except in these things. "We may have hope." This is the second branch of the exposition, or the more remote end, whereby the apostle explains 'the wisdom' which we learn from the things written aforetime concerning Christ, and which he has spoken of as consisting in its parts—'holy patience,' and 'joy of the Spirit.' This more remote end is—"the hope that putteth not

to shame," (c. v. 5.) Observe therefore here, that, according to the apostle, the twofold end of all scripture is :—'holy wisdom;' and 'hope that putteth not to shame.'

5. From this to the 15th verse, we have next the conclusion, and that twofold: the one special, having a particular respect to the duty of strong and weak brethren, concerning which the apostle has heretofore treated in c. xiv.; the other common, having respect to the whole discussion from the 16th verse of c. i. up to this place. The first conclusion is contained in the three verses, 5, 6, 7, amplified by the adjunct of the wish, or holy desire, of the apostle; and this wish he amplifies in a threefold manner. "The God of endurance and of comfort." This description of God is borrowed from the parts of 'the instruction'* of Christians in the preceding verse: and Jehovah is called—"the God of endurance," not only because he is long-suffering and slow to wrath, 'enduring with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath framed for destruction;' but still more and especially, in this place, because it is he alone who, through his Spirit, works in his own people those parts of Christian wisdom of which we have spoken. "Grant you." This is the wish or desire of the apostle—'God grant you to be similarly affected one towards another:' he desires, both for the believing Jews who were at Rome, and for the Gentiles, whether strong or weaker—'a holy unanimity,' or 'mutual concord,' so that neither the weak should be offended by the strength of the strong, nor the strong by the weakness of the weak; but that each should perform their duty to the others—the strong by bearing with the weaknesses of the weak, and the weak by pleasantly lending themselves to be instructed by the strong. "According to Jesus Christ." This is the second amplification of the wish, from the adjunct of the manner in which he desires that they should be of the same mind one towards another: the apostle desires that they should be of the same mind, not in any manner they pleased, nor in any other manner than that which is according to Christ Jesus.

* Διδαχαλίας.

Moreover, "to be of the same mind,"* or 'to be mutually concordant,' is nothing else than—'that as many as belong to Christ should believe the same thing, and act with unanimity according to the scriptures;' so that the concord of Christians in Jesus Christ, wholly consists in—the holy agreement of all, in the faith of Christ, and the obedience of faith according to the scriptures.

6. "That, with one accord, ye may, with one mouth, glorify God." This is the third amplification of the wish, from the holy end of that 'unanimity' or 'concord;' which end is—'the glorifying of God by all, with one accord, in the same manner, or, as it were, with one mouth.' "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." This is a description of God, whom he wishes them to glorify with one accord, taken from the relative opposite—'the God whom I wish you to glorify is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' He adds this description, not only to divert the minds of Christians from the polytheism, or multitude of gods of ancient Rome, which the Romans, like other Gentiles, had formerly worshipped; but still more, in order that he may stir them up to glorify God with one accord, by reminding them of the distinguished benefit which all who belong to Christ enjoy from God; for all who belong to Christ Jesus are assured that God is also their Father in Jesus Christ.

7. Hitherto we have had the amplification of the first conclusion, or the wish of the apostle: here we have the conclusion itself, concerning 'receiving one another,' viz.—'the reception of the weak by the strong, and the following of the strong by the weak, with one accord.' "Even as Christ also hath received us to the glory of God." This is an illustration of the conclusion from the like: the similitude, first and more especially, having respect to the stronger, and admonishing them; next and secondarily, to the weak also. The similitude is taken from 'our own reception by Jesus Christ our Saviour;' and is amplified from the end of that

* Τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν.

reception, which is:—'that as he himself is glorious, so we may become partakers in him of the glory of God;' of that 'glory,' namely, 'which God gives, in Christ, to those whom he foreknew, in order that he may be worthy to be admired, in the glorification of his saints, on that day.' This similitude, I say, has respect, first of all, to the stronger; who are thereby admonished to receive the weaker, as Christ—who, in every view, is incomparably our superior—has received us; that in him, and through him, we may become partakers of the glory of God. Then it has respect to the weak; because as the Church, received into grace, follows Jesus Christ, so the weak should follow their stronger brethren, until they themselves also are perfected in grace. From this I would have you observe, that the grace displayed by Jesus Christ to us, and the obedience of faith which, through his Spirit, he works in us who believe, ought to be, and always has been the model, or pattern, of every duty which we owe one to another, both the strong to the weak, and the weak to the stronger. Accordingly, this argument from Christ and the Church is one which is very familiar to this apostle; as in Eph. v. 25—"Husbands, love your wives even as Christ also loved the Church;" and in the preceding (24th) verse—"Therefore, as the Church is subject unto Christ so (let) wives also (be subject) to their husbands in all things:" so in Philip. ii. 5, when he exhorts them to be "unanimous," and that every one in the Church should be attentive to the good of another he employs this same argument—"Let the same mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus."

8. "(This) I say, moreover, that Jesus Christ was the minister." Now follows the common conclusion of the whole preceding discussion; adapted, however, to the foregoing conclusion concerning the particular duty of the strong and the weak, as appears from this, that in the present conclusion, he calls Jesus Christ—a "minister," 'the minister,' namely, 'of that reception of us to the glory of God,' which was spoken of in the amplification of the foregoing conclusion. Accordingly, in these words—"(this) I say moreover,"

is contained the transition, whereby the apostle passes from the foregoing particular conclusion to the common conclusion of his whole discussion, thus far, in this epistle; so that the meaning of the words is:—'what I say in the conclusion just given, and in the whole preceding discussion, from the commencement, is this—that Jesus Christ is a minister, and that of God;' whence, in Isaiah xlii. 1, God says of Christ,—"behold my servant." The general conclusion, therefore, of the whole discussion, thus far, is this—'that Jesus Christ, and he alone, is the minister of God to our salvation:' so the apostle has commenced the whole discussion—'the gospel of Jesus Christ is the power of God unto salvation to those who believe;' and so he now concludes it—'Jesus Christ, announced in the gospel, is the minister of God unto salvation to those who believe, that we may be ministers unto salvation to one another.' "Of the circumcision." Jesus Christ never circumcised any man ministerially, nor was he ever minister of any sacrament, except the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, of which, as of all the sacraments, he is the author, and of which, as his proper function, he is the minister: when he is here called—"the minister of the circumcision," therefore, it is by metonymy of the adjunct for the subject; so that the meaning is—'he was the minister of God to the circumcised,' that is, 'to the legal church, or the people of God under the law.' For if any one prefers to say, that there is here a synecdoche, and that the part is put for the whole, viz., "circumcision," a part of the legal service, for 'the whole service of the law,' I do not see how that can be correctly asserted; since Jesus Christ came, not to give the law, but to announce the gospel, as he himself says, Isaiah lxi. 1. It is true that he came to keep the law, and to keep it fully, as he himself teaches us, Matt. v. 17; but not to be a minister of the law, but the minister of God, unto salvation, of the people of the law: Jesus Christ, therefore, came to be the minister of God unto salvation of as many of the circumcised as should believe; as Paul has spoken at the outset. Accordingly, in this and the following verses, as far as verse 13, he amplifies this 'ministry' of Jesus Christ, whereby he is 'the minister of God

unto the salvation of those who believe,' and that by distribution according to its objects: Jesus Christ is the minister of God unto salvation 'to the circumcised,' in this verse; and 'to the uncircumcised,' in the verses that follow. "For the truth of God." He here illustrates the first particular of the distribution, viz.—'the ministry of the circumcision,' or 'the ministry of Christ to the circumcised;' the argument of illustration being taken from the end:—Christ was sent to the circumcised "for the truth of God;" that is—'that the truth of God, or that God is true in all the promises which he promised to the circumcised, or the people under the law, might become known and be made manifest to all, both Jews and Gentiles.' "That he might perform the promises of the fathers." The sense which we have given, viz.—'that the truth of God is to be manifested by this ministry, whereby Christ is the minister of the circumcision,' is plain from this exposition subjoined to the foregoing end: for to be "minister of the circumcision for the truth of God," is nothing else, according to the exposition of the apostle, than—'to be the minister of the circumcision that he might perform the promises of the fathers,' that is, 'made unto the fathers.'

9. "And that the Gentiles may glorify God for his mercy." He scrupulously suppresses the second particular of the distribution, which is this—'Jesus Christ is the minister of God unto salvation to the uncircumcised Gentiles,' and which he expresses in chapter iii. verses 29, 30; whence, in chapter iv. verses 11, 12, Abraham is called—"the father" both "of those that believe in uncircumcision, and of the circumcision." For this scrupulous suppression, there seem to be two reasons. The first is, that he might avoid offending the Jews, to whom nothing was more incredible, and even offensive, than that it should be said that God was the God of the Gentiles also, or that the Messiah was to be sent to them unto salvation: as clearly appears, both from the hesitation of Peter, who would not go to Cornelius until the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles had been revealed to him by God, in a vision; and from the accusation against him, when he returned to Jeru-

salem, (Acts xi. 2.) The second is, because there was no ministry of the uncircumcision, as there was of the circumcision, until Christ himself, the shepherd of the sheep, came to gather into one body with the people of the circumcision, the Gentiles, scattered and straying without a shepherd; as he himself teaches the circumcised, John x. 16. Thus, therefore, he suppresses the second particular of the distribution. In these words, however, we have his illustration of it, which is taken, like that of the first particular, from the end; so that the full meaning of the passage is this:—Jesus Christ is the minister of God unto salvation to the Gentiles, in order that the Gentiles may glorify God:' and this glorifying of God by the Gentiles is here explained by its efficient cause, which is—'the mercy of God appearing in the mission of his promised Son, as minister unto salvation to them also.' "According as it is written." He proceeds to prove, by the authority of the scriptures, the second particular of the distribution, viz.—'that Christ is the minister of God unto salvation to the Gentiles,' from the end whereby he has illustrated it, namely—'that the Gentiles may glorify God for his mercy towards them.' Four scriptures are adduced by him to prove it: the first is Ps. xviii. 49; the second from Deut. xxxii. 43; the third from Ps. cxvii. 1; the fourth from Isaiah xi. 10. As to the first scripture, 'David' appears as a type of Christ, and that in the two following respects: first, in his victory over all his enemies, even the most deadly; secondly, in the effect of his victory, which is expressed by a sort of rhetorical climax:—"I will confess unto thee (because thou hast given me the victory); I will sing unto thy name (because thou hast given me the victory);" that is—'I will glorify thee, not only by confessing the benefit with my mouth, but also by singing and exultation.' Lastly, the subject of these effects of the victory is added:—'I will confess and sing, not among thine ancient people only, but among the Gentiles also, and these the most distant in the earth.' The contest of David was with Saul, by the removal of whom God had given him the victory, and fulfilled his promise; wherefore he pledges himself to his God to two things: to—'the confession of Jehovah as the one

true God,' and 'exultation in him as his sole deliverer;' and these not only in the kingdom already given to him, or within the territories of the people of God, but also among the neighbouring Gentiles whom God had subdued under him. This is the type. The thing signified by the type is—'the man Christ Jesus,' who had to contend, for man's deliverance, with the old serpent, and all his power; over whom his Father gave him the victory, through the deity that dwelt in him: and, like David, so he too promises confession with the mouth, and exultation; and these, not merely among God's ancient people, but also among the Gentiles to the utmost ends of the earth. There is, however, an observable difference between the type, and the Lord himself who was signified by the type. David promises the confession of his own mouth, and the exultation of his own heart; that is—'that he would both confess Jehovah as his God, and exult in him whithersoever he went:' but when the similitude is applied to the man Jesus, the meaning is:—'that the man Jesus Christ, having been exalted by the power of God above the old serpent, and all his crew, will invite the world to the confession of God, and exultation in the Lord; not with his own mouth merely—because he was about to ascend to his father—but with the mouths and hearts of those who should reap spiritual advantage from his victory; and these, not only Israelites—who should confess and exult from a consciousness of the imputation of Christ's victory to themselves—but the elect of God from among all the Gentiles, to the utmost ends of the whole earth.' By this effect of 'the confession and exultation of the Gentiles,' therefore, the apostle here proves their effectual calling, and the end of their calling, viz.:—'that God, in Christ, has given remission of sins unto salvation to them also, that they too may extol Jehovah for his mercy in Christ Jesus.'

10. "Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people." This is a common exhortation to Israel, and the Gentiles, to rejoice in Jehovah on account of the common salvation, bestowed upon both after long desolation under the vengeance of God, which the Israelites, as well as

the Gentiles, had brought upon themselves by their transgressions against Jehovah. And that this is the meaning is manifest from the connection of the whole song. For in the previous part of the song, he has rehearsed the vast benefits of Jehovah to Israel; and from the beginnings observed under his own rule, he foretells, by the Holy Spirit, the astonishing ingratitude of the Israelites, whereby they would afterwards provoke Jehovah, the God who had bestowed these blessings upon them: hence, in the third place, he warns them that, as hitherto, in the time of Moses, the other nations had been rejected, so it would come to pass that God would at length reject Israel also, for wickedness in them, similar to the wickedness of the Gentiles: in the fourth place, by way of epanorthosis, he foretells, that the remnant of Israel will be gathered again to Jehovah, in the Messiah, of whom he had spoken as a prophet, like to himself, to be raised up from the midst of the Israelites: and in order that he may shew that the Gentiles, who had previously been rejected, would be partakers with Israel in this benefit of gathering again, in these words he exhorts the Gentiles also to rejoice in Jehovah, with Israel gathered again. Hence Paul infers from the exhortation of Moses—'the gathering again of the Gentiles in common with the Israelites, that Jehovah may be extolled by both for his mercy in Jesus Christ.' One thing in this scripture must be noticed, which has perplexed many interpreters. In Moses there is an asyndeton, or omission of the copula; so that the literal translation of the words is—"Rejoice, ye Gentiles, his people," for—'and his people;' the copula being understood: this copula, Paul, here, as everywhere, assigning the precedence to Israel in that effect of exultation, renders, consistently with the idiom of the original, by the preposition 'with;'—"rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people (preceding you in that effect of exultation.)" For, in the Hebrew language, both these things are admissible—both that the conjunction *Vau* may be frequently omitted; and that the same, whether expressed or understood, may be rendered by the preposition 'with:' and both are here observed and followed by Paul in this scripture, under the teaching of the

Holy Spirit, who spoke in Moses; whence, under the guidance of the same Spirit, he renders the words of Moses thus:—"Rejoice, ye Gentiles *with* his people."*

11. In the third scripture, also, the apostle deduces the cause from its effect, or the calling of the Gentiles to salvation in common with Israel, from the fact—'that the Holy Spirit, by the psalmist, in Ps. cxvii., had long before exhorted the Gentiles, as well as the people of Israel, to praise Jehovah for that salvation;' which 'praising' is the effect of salvation bestowed.

12. In the fourth prophetical scripture, Isaiah predicts two things. The first is—'that when Jesus Christ, the Messiah, should come, he would reign over the Gentiles; and as not only Israel, but the Gentiles also were subject to David and Solomon—each of whom was in that respect a type of Christ—so not Israel only, but also the Gentiles should be subject to the sceptre of the kingdom of Christ. 'The second thing which he predicts is—'that the Gentiles, being subject to Christ, would place their hope in him.' And from these two things—viz., 'the extension of the kingdom of Christ over the Gentiles,' and 'the placing of the hope of the Gentiles in him'—the apostle deduces the gathering again of the Gentiles to the kingdom of Christ.

13. "(I wish,) moreover, that the God of hope may fill you with joy and peace." The conclusion having now been established by amplification, viz.—'that Jesus Christ is minister to announce the truth of God both to the circumcised and to the Gentiles,'—this conclusion, I say, or rather the latter part of it, namely—'that Jesus Christ has been made God's minister to the Gentiles,' having been established by various testimonies of scripture; he now com-

* Ingenious as this explanation is, it is more probable that the apostle quotes directly from the Septuagint; since he gives the passage in the *ipsissima verba* of that version. In regard to the Hebrew text, one, at least, of Dr Kennicott's MSS. has עם, which signifies "with," before עמו, "his people;" and which may, after all, be the true reading.—*Transl.*

mends to God this same conclusion of his, thus amplified and established, that he may work it in their hearts, and wishes—'that God may fill them with joy and peace,' that is, 'so renew them, that they may rejoice more and more every day, to live in peace with one another unto God.' For 'to be filled with joy,' is—'to rejoice much,' and refers to an inward affection; to be 'filled with peace,' again, is—'to attain a life of much peace,' and refers to the outward behaviour. "To be filled with joy," therefore, is—'to rejoice daily, more and more, in a life of peace with one another, from feeling more and more every day, that the joy of the Holy Spirit is increasing within them, as the result of their own reconciliation with God.' This benefit which he wishes for them, the apostle variously amplifies: first, by its primary efficient cause, which is—"the God of (their) hope;" next, by the adjunct of the manner in which this benefit is effected for them, viz.—"in believing," (τῷ πιστεύειν); thirdly, by its end—"that ye may abound in hope," &c.; and fourthly, by the adjunct of—'his own persuasion,' in the following verse. As regards the first part of the amplification, he calls the author of the joy and peace of Christians—"the God of (their) hope," that is, 'the God of the completion of their peace with himself, in the life which is to come.' The force of the argument is most convincing, therefore, from this first amplification: for it arises both from authorship, because the benefit is wished for from God; and from a further benefit to come, inasmuch as he is styled—"the God of hope," that is, 'the God of the completion of the peace of all who have been reconciled to God in Jesus Christ, in the beginning of which here, they should rejoice, and in the completion of which hereafter, they shall fully rejoice.' I come now to the second part of the amplification, or the manner in which the benefit is enjoyed; which the apostle here intimates consists solely in—"believing," to teach us:—'that neither joy nor peace can either begin here, or be completed hereafter, except in Christ apprehended by faith, and through Christ apprehended by faith.' "That ye may abound in hope." This is the amplification of the wish of the apostle from its end: he wishes

that they may rejoice, and increase in joy and peace more and more every day, or rejoice daily, more and more, in living at peace with one another, from a consciousness of the joy of the Holy Spirit within them, arising from a consciousness of their reconciliation and peace with God—this, I say, he desires for them, for this end—'that they may abound in hope;' that is—'that the hope of the completion of their joy and peace, may increase within them more and more every day.' "Through the power of the Holy Spirit." He illustrates the end by the manner of effecting it; which he here informs us is—"the power"—that is, 'the inward working'—"of the Holy Spirit:" for as we have neither joy nor peace, either begun here, or to be completed hereafter, except through faith and hope; so have we neither any present faith, nor any hope for the future, except through the power and inward working of the Holy Spirit.

14. And I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren. This is the fourth illustration of the thing wished for, from the adjunct of 'his own persuasion.' And here it should be observed, in passing, that in these words he includes both the joy and the peace under the one term of—"goodness," to teach us:—'that it can be well with no one, either here or hereafter, except with him who rejoices to live in peace here, in the hope of both his joy and peace being completed through Jesus Christ.' Then, as for his saying—'that he is persuaded they are full of it,' nothing is more certain than that the 'fulness' of which the apostle here speaks is to be understood of—'the measure of grace which those who are stronger attain in the present life:' since otherwise, the fulness, properly speaking, of every spiritual grace is only begun here, the perfection of it being reserved for the future life; as this same apostle avows in regard to himself. "Being filled with all knowledge." He next illustrates 'the fulness of goodness' by its cause; which is both prior and superior, namely—'the fulness of the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ:' for, until the mind be illuminated with this knowledge, it is certain, not only that we cannot

be full of goodness, but that that goodness of which the apostle here speaks, whether joy in affection, or peace in life, could not so much as be begun in us. "Able also to admonish one another." He further amplifies the fulness of knowledge by its effect, which effect is—'mutual admonition, resulting from that knowledge, to joy and peace.'

15. Thus far, from the 16th verse of chap. i., the apostle has been engaged in discussing righteousness, and the life of those who are made righteous, both that which is eternal, and that which is begun here through new obedience; and has wound up the discussion by a twofold conclusion, in the ten verses immediately preceding. Now follows the third part of the epistle; in which, as he commenced the said discussion concerning righteousness and life with a lengthened exordium, in the first six verses of chap. i., so now he brings this same writing of his to a close by a multifarious admonition and salutation, from this 15th verse of chap. xv., to the end. It may therefore, without impropriety, be said, that in this third part of the epistle, the general discussion having been concluded, he proceeds to treat of particular matters; all of them however truly pious, and in keeping with the general discussion. These, moreover, are twofold: for they are either such as pertain to the apostle himself, in the remainder of this chapter; or such as respect others, in the chapter that follows. As regards the former, viz., those which pertain to himself, they are twofold; for, in the first place, he guards against the offence which, otherwise, that which he has previously written might perhaps give to some of the Romans; and, in the second place, as in the exordium, so now in the conclusion of the epistle, he seeks to gain the goodwill of the Romans to whom he writes. He guards against the offence in two ways: first, by a succinct and brief profession of his partnership with them; and next, by the establishment of his authority. As regards his partnership with them, he professes it when he affirms—'that he writes to them as a brother to brethren,' or 'that he esteems those to whom he writes as

brethren:' for those who are 'brethren' must necessarily be connected together in a partnership of various kinds; for they are the children of the same parent, they belong to the same house and family, and have a share in the goods of the common family: these, therefore, should least of all be offended with each other. The second thing whereby he guards against the offence which the Romans might take, is the establishment of his authority; to which he approaches by a sort of pious invalidating of that authority, and the assigning of a reason. For if the Romans should be disposed to charge him with boldness in writing more boldly to them, with a view to prevent their being offended by this boldness, or freedom of his in writing, he first of all confesses concerning himself—'that he has written more boldly to them *in part*:' he then assigns a reason for this freedom of his, which they might perhaps call—'boldness,' but which he confesses to be—'boldness in part;' both that they may see that it is not boldness, but pious freedom in Christ, and that he may be able freely to profess it to them in future. "I have written more boldly to you, brethren." This is the common proposition, both of the profession whereby he professes his partnership with them, and of the confession whereby he confesses that he is guilty. "In part." This is an epanorthosis of his confession, whereby he mitigates his boldness, and shows that there is nothing wrong in it, although confessed: for "to have written more boldly in part," is—'to have written freely to them in Christ,' although as yet unknown to him; and that because of his persuasion concerning them, that they were both in Christ, and "full of goodness" (as it is said in ver. 14), that is—'that they were such as he could write to in Christ.' 'If, therefore, any of them should be obstinately bent on charging the apostle with boldness in writing, he most effectually convicts such, by this epanorthosis, as well as by his own judgment concerning them, of being destitute of the grace of Jesus Christ: for hitherto he confesses the charge of boldness, only in so far as he has written freely, not from knowledge—since he has not yet seen them—but from the persuasion that grace has been bestowed upon them.

"As reminding you together." This is a second epanorthosis of his confession and mitigation of his boldness, from the subject of his writing; which subject is—a "reminding together;" that is—'an admonishing, both of himself and them jointly, to lay hold of offered grace:' for ἐπαμιμήσκειν is—'to put in mind others as well as myself,' or 'others also besides myself;' the force of the preposition ἐπὶ in composition being such, that ἐπαμιμνήσκειν is—'to remind you together with myself,' or 'to put you in mind along with myself.' The apostle therefore mitigates the charge of boldness, in this second epanorthosis, in such a way as to make it plain to them, that he has written nothing so boldly to them which he has not also said to himself, and of which he would not remind himself together with them. "Because of the grace which has been given to me by God." Next comes the establishment of his authority, which he has already proposed by a sort of pious invalidating of it; with a view to shew clearly that he is not bold at all, but free in Christ, in thus writing to them. The arguments by which he establishes his freedom are two. The first is contained in the words quoted; and is taken from the efficient cause of the freedom, namely—'the grace given to him from God.' By "grace," the apostle here means what, in 1 Cor. ix. 17, he calls—"a dispensation of the gospel committed to him;" and which, in 1 Tim. i. 12, he superadds, as a higher grace, to his own effectual calling to Christ. In 1 Tim. v. 17, he decrees to this, as a superior grace, if added to a previous effectual calling to Christ, a twofold honour in the Church. From this grace, the foundation of twofold honour, conferred upon him, he establishes his authority, and his freedom in writing either to the Romans, or to any church whatever.

16. "For this, that I should be a minister." He now explains the grace given to him from God, whereby he has established his authority, by its general end. The general end is—'the ministry:' Paul asserts that grace has been given to him—"that he might be a minister of Jesus Christ." The ministry he explains by its threefold subject; and particular end. The subject is threefold: the sub-

ject *of which; to which;* and *in which.* The subject *of which,* is—'Jesus Christ:' grace has been given to Paul that he might be—"a minister of Jesus Christ." The subject *to which,* is—'the Gentiles:' Paul is—"a minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles." The subject *in which,* is—'the gospel:' Paul is—'a minister of Jesus Christ in the gospel,' or "officiating in the gospel." The particular end is—'the offering up of the Gentiles:' Paul is a minister of Jesus Christ—'that the Gentiles may become an offering to Jehovah.' "Acceptable, sanctified." He illustrates the offering up of the Gentiles, whereby they are offered up to Jehovah through the gospel, by its two adjuncts: of which the first is—'its acceptableness' in Jesus Christ the Son of God; and the second—'the sanctifying' of the same 'through the Holy Spirit' of the Father and the Son.

17. "I have therefore whereof I may glory." This is the conclusion of the first establishment; where observe, that what the Romans might erroneously term 'boldness,' but he himself has professed to be 'freedom in Christ,' he here calls—'glorying in the things which pertain to God.' The entire reasoning of the apostle, therefore, is to this effect:—

'He who has grace given to him from God, has whereof he may glory in the discharge of that grace, or can be free, although the world may construe his freedom into boldness;

'But I,' says the apostle, 'have grace given to me from God, that I should serve Christ in the gospel, for the sake of the Gentiles:

'Therefore I have whereof I may glory in the things which belong to God, or I can be free in preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, although some may construe my liberty into boldness.'

"By Jesus Christ." He next illustrates his 'glorying,' or 'freedom, in proclaiming the gospel,' by its efficient cause and subject. The efficient cause is—'Jesus Christ:' for as every one who enters rightly upon the office of preaching the gospel, enters upon it by Jesus Christ; so unless he be sustained by Christ in preaching, he must of necessity fail by the way. Therefore, as in 1 Tim. i. 12,

the apostle acknowledges, that it was by Jesus Christ that he had been put into the ministry, so he here ascribes it to Jesus Christ alone, that he can be free, or may glory, in preaching the gospel. "In the things which pertain to God." This is a second illustration of his 'glorying' or 'freedom,' from its subject: 'Paul glories, or is free, neither in sinning nor in any of the things of the world, but in the things which pertain to God; that is, in the business of preaching the gospel of God,' or 'the dispensation of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven,' as he elsewhere speaks, (1 Cor. iv. 1.)

18. Next comes the second argument for this freedom, drawn from its effect. The effect is—'the inducing of the Gentiles to the obedience of Christ:' and this is amplified, first, by its primary cause, which is—'Christ;' secondly, by the instrumental or subordinate cause, the instrumental cause, or instrument of Jesus Christ being—'Paul:'—

'Through me, Paul, Christ has induced the Gentiles to obedience:

'Therefore I have whereof I may glory, or I can use freedom in speaking and writing to the Gentiles.'

The antecedent of this enthymeme, which is given in verse 18, is there also proved; and, is variously amplified from that verse as far as verse 22. "For I have not dared to speak of any thing except what Christ hath wrought through me." The proof of the antecedent is taken from the adjunct of its—'attestation:'—

'Jesus Christ knows that I speak the truth, and that I dare not speak of what he does not work through me:

'Therefore, it is true that through me, Paul, Jesus Christ has induced the Gentiles to obedience.'

"In inducing the Gentiles to obedience." This is the consequent of the last enthymeme, and antecedent of the second argument:—'Jesus Christ has induced the Gentiles to obedience through me Paul.' But, 'for the Gentiles to be induced to obedience,' denotes these two things:—both 'faith;' and 'the obedience of faith.' Therefore, such is the work which Jesus Christ wrought through

Paul; or it consists of two parts: first, he effects that they should believe the gospel; then, that they should live in a manner worthy of the gospel—both of which are included by the apostle under the one head of 'obedience to Christ.' "By words and deeds." Here follows a threefold illustration of the antecedent, or 'the inducing of the Gentiles to obedience.' The first illustration is taken from the adjunct of the means, which, it is here intimated, was threefold: for Paul induced the Gentiles to obedience, first—"by words;" then—"by deeds;" thirdly—"by the power of the Holy Spirit." By "words" I understand—'the preaching of the gospel.'

19. "By the power of signs and wonders." The apostle himself explains the deeds by which he induced the Gentiles to obedience, by their three adjuncts: they were—"signs;" they were—"wonders;" and they were—effected "by power." In calling them "signs," he intimates—'that these works signified to the Gentiles that God was with him; that he was the messenger of God; and that the word of his preaching was the gospel of salvation (as is acknowledged by the Pythoness, Acts xvi. 17).' They are called "wonders," inasmuch as they were 'strange, unusual, and truly miraculous.' In saying that they were "(effected) by power," he would teach us—'that they were effected, not by the might of man or of any creature, but of God alone, with this intent, that they should sign and seal the preaching;' as Peter teaches, Acts iii. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, where he shews that the miraculous cure of the lame man was effected by divine power, that it might be a sign to confirm their preaching concerning Christ. The "deeds," therefore, of which Paul here speaks, are—'the miracles wrought through him among the Gentiles;' and these, by the peculiar might and power of God, in confirmation of his "words," or of 'the gospel which he preached.' "By the power of the Spirit of God." This is the third means whereby the inducing of the Gentiles to obedience is amplified. By "the power of the Spirit of God," moreover, I understand here—'the gifts of the Holy Spirit conferred upon the Gentiles, by the same might and power of God, in

confirmation of Paul's preaching.' If, therefore, you inquire concerning the means by which the Gentiles were induced to obedience, Paul himself replies—'that it was by means of the preaching of the gospel, confirmed by miracles and the gifts of the Holy Spirit;' on account of which confirmation, and efficacy in inducing the Gentiles to obedience, the apostle, in 1 Cor. i. 18, calls "the preaching of the cross," to those that perish—"foolishness," but to those who are saved—"power," namely, from its powerful confirmation, and powerful operation. "So that from Jerusalem." This is the second illustration of the inducing of the Gentiles to obedience, from the subject-place:—'everywhere, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, Christ, through me, has induced the Gentiles to obedience.' This subject-place, again, is amplified by a comparison of similarity:—'I have so induced the Gentiles to obedience in these places, that in them all I have fulfilled the office of preaching the gospel of Christ.' Moreover, 'to fulfil the office of preaching the gospel,' is—'to effect that the gospel should be preached, not partly, but fully.' The apostle therefore says—'that in all these places, from Jerusalem to Illyricum, he had not only planted, but fully established churches, by the preaching of the gospel;' as we read was done at Ephesus, at Corinth, and in Crete, where, by means of his assistants, the evangelists Timothy, Titus, and Apollos, he watered, until he had fully established the churches originally planted by himself.

20. "Eagerly desiring, moreover, so to preach," &c. This is the third illustration of the inducing of the Gentiles, from the adjunct of the former ignorance of these same Gentiles who had been induced, through Paul, to obedience:—'the Gentiles whom Christ, through me, has induced to obedience, had not even heard of Jesus Christ before.' That ignorance is also amplified by a comparison of similarity between Paul's desire to preach, and the ignorance of the Gentiles:—'As the Gentiles had not even heard of Christ, so was I eagerly desirous to preach Christ where he had not been even named before.' The apodosis of the comparison is contained in

this 20th verse, being amplified by the end, which is—'that Paul might not build on another man's foundation.'

21. "But according as it is written." This is the protasis of the comparison, established by the testimony of scripture, concerning—'Christ never having been announced to the Gentiles, before they saw and understood through my preaching.'

22. "For which cause, also, I have been often hindered from coming to you." This is a proleptical transition from the first part of the particulars respecting himself—or his account of the fruit of his labours in the gospel, whence he has said that his confidence in writing more boldly to them, arose—to the second part, in which he endeavours to gain the good will of the Romans, to whom he has written with holy confidence. The objection which he anticipates is this:—'seeing that Illyricum is a maritime state of Greece, on the south-eastern coast of the Adriatic Sea, separated only by a small intervening space from Italy; why have you not come to us who are in Rome, the chief state of all Europe, that you might extend your labours in the gospel there, especially considering the importance of the place?' The apostle replies—'that he had purposed to come to them, and that often, but that hitherto he had been hindered from coming.' There is a similar prolepsis, as we have seen, in the exordium of the epistle, chapter i. verse 13, where he seeks to gain the good will of the Romans; as he also does in the verses that follow, to which he makes a transition by this prolepsis.

23. In the subsequent verses, on to the close of the chapter, he seeks to gain the good will of the Romans. The arguments which he employs for this purpose are three. The first is taken from his promise to come to them, as far as verse 30. This promise, which is proposed in the 24th verse, he both confirms and amplifies. The arguments by which he confirms it, in this 23d verse, are two. The first is taken from what equally follows in the case of disparates,

or contraries, those being here indicated by the terms 'hither,' and thither,' or 'into those regions.' But if we may be allowed to dispose the argument in full syllogism, he reasons thus:—

'If I have no longer a place here, I must come thither to preach the gospel;

'But the former is true:

'Therefore so is also the latter.'

"But now, having no longer a place in these regions." This is the assumption of the syllogism, or antecedent of the enthymeme. By "these regions," he means—'all those, from Jerusalem and the surrounding districts, to Illyricum.' "But having had a longing for many years to come to you." This is the second confirmation of the promise, from the adjunct of his—"longing:" and this again is amplified by the adjunct of the time; he had now had this longing —"for many years." The apostle therefore thus argues:—

'It is many years since I longed to see you:

'Therefore I will come to see you at length.'

The antecedent is contained in the words quoted.

24. Next comes the amplification of the promise, and that fourfold. "Whensoever I take my journey into Spain." The first amplification of the promise is from the adjunct of the time:—'when I travel into Spain, I will come to you.' "I will come to you." This is the proposition of the promise, and conclusion of each of the arguments contained in verse 23. "For I hope." This is the third argument in confirmation of the promise, from the adjunct of—'the hope which he had of coming to see them.' This 'seeing them' (τὸ ἰδεῖν), he also amplifies, first, by the occasion of it, or, if you please, by its efficient cause; which is—'his passing through them into Spain.' "And that I shall be brought on my way thither by you." This is a second amplification of his 'seeing them' (τοῦ ἰδεῖν) from the kindness which he expected from them in return, namely—'to be brought by them on his way into Spain.' "If, however, I shall first be in part satisfied with your company." This is an epanorthosis of his departure from them and being

brought on his way into Spain:—'before however I depart, or be brought by you on my way into Spain, I shall be satisfied with your company:' which satisfaction from his company with them, he indeed again corrects, when he adds—"in part;" thus intimating—'that our joy from company with each other, yea, even that which springs from mutual comfort, and the bestowal of the grace of the gospel, shall not be fully, but only somewhat satisfied, so long as we are together here on the earth.'

25. "But now I journey to Jerusalem." This is a second illustration of the promise, from his present journeying in the contrary direction: 'I now take my journey, not towards the west, or into Spain, so as to see you now in this journeying; but contrariwise, towards the east, or to Jerusalem.' "Ministering to the saints." This is an illustration of his present journeying, from its end, which is—'to minister to the saints.' Moreover "to minister to the saints" here is—'to convey, for the necessary uses of the saints, the subsidy which had been contributed and collected among the Gentile churches, for the relief of the necessity of the saints at Jerusalem, and throughout all Judea;' to which the prophecy of Agabus concerning the dearth which was to happen in the world (Acts xi. 28, 29, 30), gave occasion. There seems to be a double reason for the contribution by the Gentiles of this subsidy for the believing Jews. The first is:—that that chastisement, or want of necessaries, in Judea, was greatly aggravated by the hatred of their fellow-countrymen who did not believe, and who, notwithstanding, viz. shortly before the final destruction of Jerusalem, drove the believers to such necessity, that they were forced to retire, and banished from their homes; which happened to the Jewish church within forty years after Christ. This necessity—which was first of all to light upon the churches of the Jews, and which was announced by the Jews to the churches of the Gentiles, as soon as it had been made known to the former from God—seems to have given occasion to this subsidy. The second reason is:—the acknowledgment of the benefit on account of which the apostle after-

wards says—'that the Gentiles were indebted to the Jews,' or were "their debtors." The benefit thus acknowledged, moreover, was twofold: The one was—that of "the word going forth from Zion," according to the ancient prophet, or of 'the gospel communicated to the Gentiles by the Jews:' the other was—the forewarning from God of this same approaching necessity, first of all revealed to the Jews, and by them communicated to the Gentiles who believed; so that they, being warned, as the Egyptians were by Joseph, might piously provide for themselves against the judgment of dearth which was about to afflict the rest of the world.

26. "For it hath pleased Macedonia and Achaia to contribute something for the poor saints who are at Jerusalem." This is the reason of the ministry for the sake of which he journeys to Jerusalem, taken from its efficient cause, which is—'the contribution and collection of a subsidy for the relief of the necessity of the saints at Jerusalem:'—

'A collection has been made,' so the apostle reasons, 'for the relief of the necessity of the saints dwelling at Jerusalem:

'Therefore I now take my journey to Jerusalem to minister to the saints.'

This collection the apostle illustrates, both by its subject-place, and by a sort of analysis of its efficient causes. The subject-place is stated to be twofold:—'that collection was made in Macedonia, and in Achaia.' The causes also are two; the proximate being—'the good pleasure of those who had made the collection.'

27. "It hath pleased them verily, and their debtors they are." He introduces, by way of epanorthosis of the prior cause, or the good pleasure of the Macedonians and Achaians, the remote cause, namely—'the debt whereby they were bound to the churches in Judea.' "For if the Gentiles have shared in their spiritual (blessings), they ought also to minister to them in carnal (blessings)." He establishes the debt whereby the Macedonians and Achaians, and indeed all believers among the Gentiles, were bound to the

churches of the Jews. The argument is taken from a comparison of majority :—

'The Jews have bestowed greater blessings upon the Gentiles :

'Therefore the Gentiles, as their debtors, should bestow those which are less, upon the Jews.'

The greater blessings, the apostle calls—"spiritual" (*τὰ πνευματικὰ*); the less—"carnal" (*τὰ σαρκικὰ*). By the term "spiritual (blessings)," he intends—both 'the gospel,' and 'gifts of the Spirit, of all sorts, conferred upon those who by faith have embraced the gospel;' among which gifts there is one—the gift and grace of prophecy, not only ordinary, but extraordinary, according to the place, time, and necessity of believers—whereby the Church is forewarned, both concerning the future benefits of God, and the judgments which he is about to bring upon the world because of sin; such as was that prophecy of Agabus. In this comparison of majority, therefore, the apostle deduces both the reasons of the debt of the Gentiles, which we have mentioned under the head of the 25th verse.

28. "When I shall have performed this." The demonstrative—"this," in these words, denotes—'the journeying which Paul had undertaken into Judea, and towards Jerusalem;' so that the meaning is :—'when I shall have accomplished that present journey of which I have just spoken.' "And shall have sealed to them this fruit." By "fruit," he means—'the subsidy which had been prepared, and for the sake of ministering which to the saints, he takes his journey to Jerusalem;' and he calls that subsidy—"fruit," because, just as good fruit is gathered from a good tree, so the Jewish churches, and pious poor who were at Jerusalem, reaped this fruit from his faithful labours in the gospel among the Gentiles. In this verse, accordingly, the apostle deduces his promise, which he has before amplified by a twofold illustration :—"I shall take my journey, through you, into Spain." He also amplifies this conclusion a third time, in this verse, by a new adjunct of the time, and that doubly defined : first, by the end of his present journeying—

'after I have performed this journey, I shall take my journey, through you, into Spain;' then by the effect of his journeying to his countrymen with alms, which is—'the sealing of the advantage redounding, both to the Jews and to the Gentiles, from his own labours in preaching the gospel.'

29. "For I know that when I come to you, I shall come with the full blessing of the gospel of Christ." This is a fourth amplification of his promise, from the adjunct of his coming, which adjunct is—'the full blessing of the gospel of Christ, about to come to you with my coming:' and this again, he illustrates by the adjunct of 'his knowledge' of it;—for I *know* that the blessing of the gospel will come with my coming.' By "blessing," he here intends—'the grace to be communicated to the Romans from the preaching of the gospel among them by himself, when he should come.' He is persuaded that this will be—"full;" which 'fulness' is to be understood of the measure of the "strong," or "perfect," as he himself speaks, in 1 Cor. ii. 6,—"we speak wisdom among the perfect,"—where he calls those "perfect," who 'had already made such progress in the grace of the gospel, that they were both looking forward to, and striving after perfection,' as he himself explains it, Phil. iii. 13, 14, 15. The apostle, therefore, does not mean to intimate, that any one can enjoy the full blessing of the gospel here, upon this earth, with that complete fulness which is prepared for the redeemed of Jehovah in Christ—for that fulness shall be the lot of the saints in the life to come; but by "fulness" he means, as I have already said —'that measure of grace of the perfect, whereby they have a persuasion here of the complete fulness to be enjoyed hereafter.'

30. Now comes the second argument for gaining their good will; which is taken from his requesting the kindness of their prayers—"I beseech you, brethren, that ye strive in prayers for me." This argument is efficacious for procuring good will, from the fact, that the request for prayers argues, in him who

makes the request, an opinion honourable in the Lord, concerning those whose prayers he requests: for we will never entreat the prayers of those of whom we have a mean opinion. By requesting the Romans, therefore, to strive for him in prayers to God, the apostle shews that he regards them as "full of goodness," of which he has before professed his persuasion (v. 14.). "Through the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of the Spirit." These prayers which he requests, he amplifies variously, by their causes, adjunct, subject, and ends. The causes are two. The first is—our "Lord Jesus Christ;" for a common participation in him as the one and same Lord of all of us who believe, should give rise in all to mutual prayers, and cause all and each of us to pray for one another through him. The second cause is—"the love of the Spirit;" which is that whereby the Holy Spirit dwells in the sanctified, and is twofold: the one is—"the love of God, shed forth in our hearts by the Spirit" himself; the other arises out of this, and is—'that with which we piously regard each other in Jesus Christ, on account of our common participation in the love of God, with which he himself regards us all in common in Christ Jesus.' I conceive that both kinds of love are to be understood here; and that the apostle founds the prayers which he requests of the Romans, on the love wherewith we are bound to regard each other in Jesus Christ, arising out of the love wherewith God himself regards us all in Christ Jesus—both of which are wrought in us by the Holy Spirit of God. The adjunct is indicated by the term—'striving,' when the apostle says—"that ye strive for me in prayers to God." 'Striving,' moreover, requires two things:—'continued struggling until the victory be known;' and 'the zeal of perseverance:' he therefore requests two things:—'that they should be earnest in praying and entreating;' and 'that they should persevere in that zeal, until at length they heard of his deliverance.' Of these prayers, as 'Paul' is the subject—for he asks them to pray for himself—so 'God' is the object:—"that ye strive—for me; to God." And he himself also is a social cause; which is intimated in these words, when he says—"I beseech you, that ye strive with

me:" for if they strove in prayers with him, and he with them, he strove as a social cause of the same affection with them.

31. "That I may be delivered from those that are disobedient in Judea." Three ends of the prayers requested are pointed out in the two following verses. The first of these is—'deliverance from the disobedient;' who are described by the subject-place of their habitation:—they are Jews, dwelling "in Judea." Moreover, by "disobedient," I understand here, not only—'those who persisted in refusing to believe on Jesus Christ,' but also—'those who, professing Christ, were false brethren, and through zeal for the law, corrupters of the gospel of Jesus Christ.' The apostle, therefore, requests the Romans to pray for him, first of all, for this end:—'that, on this perilous journey to Jerusalem, he may not be delivered over to the desires of the disobedient Jews, but may, by divine protection, be delivered from them. "That this my ministry for Jerusalem may be acceptable to the saints." This is the second end: he begs them to pray for him—'that he himself with his ministry may be acceptable to the saints in Jerusalem.'

32. "That I may come unto you with joy." This is the third and last end. He begs them to pray for him—'that having accomplished his journey to Jerusalem, he may, immediately thereafter, come to them, and through them into Spain.' This 'coming of his to them,' he amplifies by the adjunct of "joy"—"that I may come with joy;" by its efficient cause, which is—"the will of God;" and its end—"that I may, along with you, be refreshed," that is—'that I may comfort you with the gospel, and may receive comfort from you in return, viz., when I see the grace of the gospel effectual in you.' From this last end of these prayers we may see, that this epistle to the Romans was written when he was journeying to Jerusalem for the last time: for he promises that he will immediately take his journey through them into Spain; and, moreover, in ver. 23, he has shewn that he had no longer a place in these regions, as far as the Adriatic sea—on the eastern shore of

which, over against Italy, lay Illyricum, to which, he has declared in ver. 19, that he had penetrated from Jerusalem.

33. "And the God of peace (be) with you all." This is the third argument for gaining their good will; which is taken from the kindness performed by himself towards them, or his prayers for them in return: for as, in undertaking that journey, he requests them to commend him to God in their prayers; so he requests for them the presence of the God of peace for ever. He calls Jehovah —"the God of peace," because he is the author and efficient cause of our reconciliation with himself in Jesus Christ, in the consummation of which consists the blessedness and felicity of men; he therefore prays:—'that God may be ever present with them, to complete the work of peace by the mortification of sin, until that peace, and their restoration to favour with God, be perfected in Jesus Christ, when he shall present them unto God "unblameable and unreprovable." "Amen." This is the second part, and conclusion of his prayers; wherein he requests of God—'that the prayers which he has just put up for the Romans, may be ratified and accomplished by Jehovah.'

CHAPTER XVI.

Thus far, from the 13th ver. of the foregoing chap., we have had the particulars respecting himself. Next come the particulars which respect others; which are twofold: the first part contains a commendation, in vv. 1 and 2; the second a salutation, from v. 3 to the end of the chap. A *salutation*, moreover, differs from a *commendation* in this:—that a salutation is a commendation of those whom we salute, whereby we commend them to God for participation in the common salvation; a commendation, on the other hand, being that whereby we commend the commended to the care, zeal, or assistance of those to whom we commend them.

1. "Moreover I commend unto you Phœbe," &c. The apostle first amplifies, and then assigns a reason for his commendation. The amplification is taken, first of all, from its subject, and next, from its end. The subject of Paul's commendation here is *Phœbe:*—"I commend," says the apostle, "to you (who are in Rome)," or 'to the Roman church'—that is, 'I commit to your care, zeal, and assistance'—"Phœbe our sister." We have here an illustration of Phœbe from two adjuncts, namely:—first, her common, and secondly, her particular vocation. Her common vocation is indicated by the apostle's calling her—"our sister;" that is—'the daughter, through faith, of the same God with us who believe on Christ.' But 'to be the daughter of God in Christ, and through partnership in the common faith, the sister of believers,' is the common vocation of a Christian female. Phœbe, therefore, is first of all described from the circumstance—'that she is a Christian female, the daughter of God, and the sister of all who believe, through faith in Christ.' That is her common vocation. "Who is a minister to the church at Cenchrea." This is her particular vocation; she was, it appears, among the 'widows' of the Cenchrean church: unless you prefer to say, what seems more correctly said, that she was—'one who ministered to the church of Cenchrea, by hospitably entertaining pious strangers;' from which class of females, the apostle teaches, in 1 Tim. v. 10, that a widow should be chosen.

2. "That ye may receive her." This is the second amplification of the commendation of Paul, taken from the end, and that twofold, for which he has commended Phœbe to the Roman church: the first end is—'that they should receive her when she came to Rome;' the second—'that they should assist her.' "In the Lord." This is a clearing of the first end; in which there are two arguments. The first is intimated in those words: for to receive her "in the Lord," is to receive her—'as engrafted on the Lord through faith, and for the sake of the Lord on whom she is engrafted.' The first argument of the clearing may therefore be

said to be taken, either from the spiritual adjunct of Phœbe herself —'she was a female engrafted on Christ the Lord;' or from the efficient cause, viz.—'the Lord of the Romans and of Phœbe,' namely, 'Jesus Christ,' participation in whom should induce them to receive her. "As befitteth saints." The second argument of the clearing of the first end, is taken from the adjunct of 'the duty of saints:'—'it becomes saints, or those who are in the Lord, to receive those who are sanctified in the same Lord.' "And that ye may assist her in whatever matter," &c. This is the second end, amplified by its subject:—'that they should assist her in every business requiring their assistance.' From this I would have you observe, that it is lawful and customary for saints to commend saints, even in common and external affairs: thus Paul commends Phœbe to the Roman church, to be assisted by the church in any business which she might have at Rome.' "For she hath shewn hospitality to many." He next assigns a reason for his commendation, thus amplified, from the effect of Phœbe:—'she was hospitable, and had hospitably entertained many of the saints.' "And to myself also." He illustrates the effect by a comparison of majority:—'she has shewn hospitality, not only to other saints, but to myself also,' namely, 'to Paul.'

3. Next come the salutations; which are of two kinds. The first are those of Paul himself, in which he, by himself, salutes the church: first, the more distinguished in the church at Rome, as far as v. 16; then all in common, in the 16th v.; both of which he winds up by an admonition and prayers, from the 17th to the 21st verse. The salutations of Paul wherein he salutes the more distinguished and eminent in the church at Rome, are partly of single persons, who are named individually; and partly of several, who are included in a sort of common abridgment and description. Both are enumerated, one after another, in succession; not separately however, but in passing, and jointly, as suits the occasion. 'Salute Priscilla and Aquila." The first who are saluted by name are—*Priscilla* and *Aquila*. Nor should we omit to notice,

that, in the salutation, the wife is named before her husband; for Priscilla was the wife of Aquila (Acts xviii. 2): from which it appears, that as these two surpassed the rest of those who professed the gospel at that time in Rome; so Priscilla, an eminent female, surpassed her husband in the business of the gospel. Hence, in Acts xviii. 21, she is joined with her husband in more perfectly instructing Apollos, a distinguished preacher of the gospel. "My helpers in Christ Jesus." He describes those who are saluted, first, by their effects; and then, by their adjunct. The first effect is—'they helped Paul,' or 'they were the helpers of the Apostle Paul;' which effect is amplified by its subject—'in Christ Jesus,' or 'in the business of Christ.' What this 'help' was, is not here stated; nor does it seem to have consisted in 'preaching the gospel along with Paul,' but rather in—'so courageous a profession of the gospel of Christ which Paul preached, that they often exposed themselves to danger to save Paul,' as at Corinth, and on the journey to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 12.)

4. "Who, for my life, have laid down their own neck." The second effect of Priscilla and Aquila is—"they have laid down their own neck," *i. e.*—'they have exposed themselves to danger, even to death.' This effect is in like manner explained by its material cause:—they exposed themselves to the danger of losing their own life, 'to save the life of Paul,' viz., at Corinth, and on the journey to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 12), as has been already remarked. "To whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles." Thus far Priscilla and Aquila have been saluted, first of all, from their effects: they are now saluted from their adjunct, namely,—'they are persons to whom thanks are deservedly given.' And as this adjunct flows from the foregoing effects, so it is presented under the form of a comparison of majority:—'not only I, but moreover all the churches of the Gentiles deservedly give thanks to Priscilla and Aquila, for their effects,' viz., those already mentioned. For if these effects are compared together, the former shews *what* they did, namely—'they

helped Paul in the business of the gospel;' the second shews *how far* they proceeded, namely—'even to the greatest danger of their own lives:' on both which accounts, Paul, whom they had helped, as well as all the churches of the Gentiles, whom they had benefited by helping Paul in the manner mentioned—give thanks.

5. "Also the church which is in their house." The first who are saluted in an abridged form by the apostle, are—'the domestics of Priscilla and Aquila:' from which it appears, that although they were often changing their dwelling-place for the sake of the gospel —for before Paul came to Corinth, they were at Rome (Acts xviii. 2); from Corinth, they removed with Paul to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18); now, on the occasion of his last journey to Jerusalem, they are at Rome a second time; and while the apostle was a prisoner at Rome, they were living at Ephesus, (2 Tim. iv. 19)—although, I say, they were thus always "strangers on the earth," and as they lived by making tents (Acts xviii. 3), so dwelt in tents, or in an ever-shifting habitation; yet, from this passage, it appears that they had a numerous household, and many domestics: so that these two, under the gospel, somewhat resemble their progenitors, Abraham and Sarah, before the law; of whom it is also recorded (Gen. xiv.), that though always living in tents, they yet had a numerous household. This household of Aquila and Priscilla is described by its adjunct; they are—'a church of God:' that is, as there were many servants, so they were servants who feared God, and had embraced the gospel along with their master and mistress; as may be seen also in the case of the household of Abraham (Gen. xviii. 19), as well as in the fidelity of his eldest servant (Gen. xxiv.).

"Salute my beloved Epenetus." The second who is saluted by name, is described:—by his name; by 'his advanced age in Christ;' and by the adjunct of the 'love' wherewith the apostle loves him. He is *Epenetus* by name, and in point of fact, a man 'worthy of praise,'* as appears from the rest of the description: for, besides

* As the name signifies.—*Transl.*

being "beloved by the apostle," he is, moreover, "the first-fruits to Christ in Achaia," that is—'the first in Achaia who embraced the gospel of Christ under the preaching of Paul.' The first-fruits, under the law, were holy to God; and, accordingly, the apostle salutes this 'praiseworthy' man, not only as beloved by himself, but as wholly consecrated to Christ.

6. In the third place, *Mary* is saluted; who is described, not by any one effect, but by her continued course of life among the saints: namely—'that she has laboured much, according to her sex and station, in propagating the gospel:' but what station she occupied in the Church—whether she was a widow, or a wealthy and hospitable female—the apostle does not expressly state in her case, as he has before done in the case of Phœbe.

7. In the fourth place, *Andronicus* and *Julia* are saluted; and are described by their four adjuncts: first—'they were Paul's relatives, or allied to him by blood;' secondly—'they had been fellow-prisoners with him in captivity;' thirdly—'they were of great note among the apostles, and famous in the Christian Church;' fourthly—'they had been professors of the gospel before Paul.' What captivity that was, and when it happened to Paul and these relatives of his at the same time, is not shewn. Certain it is, that the apostle here speaks, either of his imprisonment at Jerusalem under Lysias, or at Cæsarea under Felix and Festus, but not at Rome; for this epistle to the Romans was written before the apostle's captivity in that city.

8. *Amphias* or, as some read, *Amphiatus*, is saluted in the fifth place; and is described by his adjunct, and its efficient cause: he is —'beloved by the apostle;' and the cause of that love is—'his participation in the Lord in common with the apostle.'

9. *Urbanus* and *Stachys* are saluted in the sixth place; and both are described: Urbanus by—'the help which he had rendered in

the business of the gospel;' and Stachys by—'the love wherewith the apostle, by whom he is saluted, regards him.'

10. Seventhly, *Apelles* is saluted, and is described by his adjunct, namely, that he is—"approved in Christ;" that is—'he was known by experience, and by having been often put to the test, to be a genuine Christian:' for I take the word δόκιμον to signify "approved" in this sense, according to the apostle's own exposition of his meaning, in 1 Cor. xi. 19. "Salute those who are of the (domestics) of Aristobulus." This is the second abridgment. I think we must regard this *Aristobulus* as some leading man of the Jewish nation, out of whose numerous household Paul here testifies, that some at Rome had embraced the gospel.

11. In the eighth place, *Herodion* is saluted; being described by the adjunct of his 'consanguinity' with the apostle: he was—the apostle's "relative." "Salute those who are of the domestics of Narcissus." This is the third salutation in an abridged form. 'The domestics of *Narcissus* are saluted; not all together, however, as in the case of those of Aristobulus, but with the introduction of a distinction,—'those who are in Christ:' by which the apostle gently hints, that whoever this Narcissus was, his household was divided; some in it being Christians, while others refused to embrace Christ.

12. In the ninth and tenth places, three females are saluted, viz. —*Tryphæna*, *Tryphosa* and *Persis*; who are each described by their effects, or—'their labours in the gospel:' but Persis, above the other two, is described by—'her much labour,' and—'the much love' wherewith she was regarded on account of her labour.

13. '*Rufus* and his mother' are saluted in the eleventh place. Both are described. Rufus is described by the adjunct of—'his being chosen by God;' or because it was clearly seen from the sincerity of his profession, that he was among the number of God's elect.

His mother, again, is described as being also—'the mother of Paul,' either from her maternal affection towards the apostle, on account of the work of the Lord in which he was engaged; or even by blood, as *Andronicus*, *Junia* and *Herodion* are called his "relatives:" from all which examples we may perceive, that as the Apostle Paul was the minister of God unto salvation, and the instrument of "a good work" to others, so he was also to many of his father's house.

14, 15. In the twelfth place, *Asyncritus*, *Phlegon*, *Hermas*, *Patrobas* and *Hermes*; *Philologus*, *Julia*, *Nereus* with his sister, and *Olympas*, are saluted: and each induction of particular individuals concludes with an epilogue, or abridged enumeration of "brethren," that is, of 'fellow-believers on Jesus Christ.' There were, therefore, it appears, these two sets of Christians living at Rome; but how separated—whether by their occupation, or in some other way—we are not here informed: one thing at least is certain, that they were all united in Christ, and in the profession of the gospel.

16. Hitherto the apostle has saluted the more distinguished saints individually, or a few included in an abridgment. He now salutes all in common with a common salutation, and that mutual, or so that they may salute one another from him. This common salutation is first explained by the adjunct of the manner; and is next enforced by a similar example. As regards the manner, the apostle bids them—"salute one another with a holy kiss;" an entreaty in which, by a metonymy of the adjunct for the subject, he commends to the Romans a holy and sincere love, as the foundation and source of all the salutations wherewith he has admonished them to salute one another: for a "kiss" is the token of 'love;' and a "holy kiss" of 'holy love in the Lord.' When, therefore, he prescribes—'the kiss of such as love,' instead of enjoining 'common love,' he requires, not so much the sign itself, as the thing signified, and that holy and in the Lord; so that the meaning is:—'salute ye one another; and see that that salutation of yours proceed from love in the Lord, or that holy love with which we who

are in Christ ought to regard each other, on account of the love wherewith God has regarded us all in common, in Christ Jesus.' The similar example by which he persuades them to salute each other mutually in a holy manner, is taken from the other churches of Christ:—

'The other churches of Christ salute you with a holy kiss, or salute you with a salutation proceeding from a holy love in the Lord:

'Therefore, do ye salute one another in like manner, or with a holy kiss.'

From this the apostle gives to learn the two following things:—first, that as it had been told him in the case of the Corinthian church, (1 Cor. i. 11); so, at the time that this epistle was written, it had become known to the apostle that there were divisions in the Roman church, both already begun, and in regard to which it was to be feared more and more every day, lest they should increase to the disturbance of the peace of the Church: secondly, that the example of other churches walking with God, should stir up every particular church to avoid divisions, and to cherish love; for so, from the holy love with which all the churches of Christ then saluted the church at Rome, the apostle admonishes the Romans to salute one another in the Lord.

17. Thus far we have had the salutations of the first kind; which the apostle concludes—first, by an admonition, from this ver. to the 20th; then with a prayer, in the 20th verse. The substance of the admonition is—'mark those that are the authors of divisions, and avoid them.' This admonition the apostle amplifies in this 17th ver.; and enforces the same in the two following vv. "I beseech you, brethren." The first amplification of the admonition is from—'the earnest affection and desire of the apostle, wherewith he is desirous that the Romans should be on their guard against this so great an evil;' which desire is expressed in the form of a rhetorical wish, whereby he beseeches them to mark and shun the authors of divisions. "And of causes of offence." The second amplification

of the admonition is from the effect of division, or schism, in the Church. This effect is—'cause of offence;' and that twofold: both that whereby many weak are made to offend, or stumble; and that by which the truth, and the professors of the truth, are evil-spoken of. Both these evils proceed from division: for both the weak, being carried away by the authors of divisions, often grievously stumble; and those who, without having examined into the matter, shun division, often blame even good men, and the truth, which otherwise is irreprehensible. For it is neither the truth, nor those who stand up for the truth, who are the cause of division; but these "authors of divisions" of whom the apostle speaks, are 'those who rise up against the truth, and, on the truth's account, harass the professors of it.' "Contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned." This is the third amplification of the admonition, from the disparate of division:—'the doctrine which ye have learned is remote from division; and division, remote and different from it.' By "doctrine" the apostle here means—'the gospel of Christ;' which is not a doctrine of divisions, but of love: for it teaches—both that the world has been reconciled to God in Christ; and that Gentiles are joined with Jews, and Jews with Gentiles, in the one sheep-fold of Christ: so that now, under the gospel, 'there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither male nor female, neither bond nor free, neither circumcised nor uncircumcised,' but all who believe are the one sheep-fold of God in Jesus Christ. This doctrine, he says—'they had learned,' and that from himself; for so I understand the apostle here to speak: for although the apostle had not yet come to Rome, nor had yet preached the gospel in that city; yet almost all those who professed the gospel in Rome, at the time when this epistle was written, had heard him, and had been taught the gospel of Christ by him elsewhere, as appears from the foregoing salutations. For Priscilla and Aquila, and the whole Church which was in their house, heard Paul, both at Corinth, and at Ephesus; and the same conclusion holds true in like manner of the rest, namely, that the others who are saluted by him, had each heard him elsewhere, and through hearing, had re-

ceived faith—as appears from almost all their descriptions: for these descriptions shew that those whom Paul salutes in the Church at Rome, had assisted Paul, and had been gathered by him into the Church, in other places; as it is said of Mary—'that she had laboured much in his behalf,' and so on. The "division" (διχοστασία), the authors of which he admonishes them to mark and avoid, is every division which is contrary to his doctrine: the admonition, however, is suggested by his experience of a particular division, whereby the true Church of Christ was troubled during all the days of the apostle's life. This was the division which arose about 'retaining, along with faith in Christ, the ceremonies of Moses, as equally necessary with faith to the salvation of believers;' as appears from the description of the division at Antioch (Acts xv.). This is the division which, first and chiefly, he admonishes the Romans to whom he writes, to avoid; but being taught by the experience of this division the devices of Satan for the time to come, and that he will harass the Church of Christ with schisms and divisions, during the whole period of her militant state—in admonishing the Romans, he admonishes the whole Church universally, to be on their guard against the authors of division contrary to his doctrine of the gospel: from which we may learn—that those who stand up for the sound doctrine of the gospel can neither be the authors, nor the followers of division; but that both these are such as depart from the gospel.

18. "For those that are such," &c. Thus far we have had the amplification: next comes the reason and enforcement of the admonition, or the cause for which the Romans should obey the apostle admonishing them. A double reason is assigned. The first is contained in this verse, being taken from the effect of those who are the authors of divisions; and that twofold. The first effect is:—

"Those that are such"—that is, 'who are the authors of dissensions and schisms'—"serve their own belly," or, as the apostle elsewhere speaks, (Phil. iii. 19)—"their belly is their god:"

'Therefore they are to be marked and shunned by the Church, as idolaters, who worship a strange god, namely, their own belly.'

This effect the apostle amplifies by a contrast:—they "serve not the Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly;" by which contrast it is the intention of the apostle to charge them with 'putting their own belly in the place of Christ:' for otherwise, it is lawful in Christ for Christians piously to care for their belly, as for their other [members]; whence the apostle elsewhere enjoins—'that he who does not work'—that is, 'who is not piously solicitous about the satisfying of his belly'—'should not eat,' that is, 'satisfy,' or 'be permitted to satisfy the wants of his belly' (2 Thess. iii. 10). "And by fair speaking and flattery," &c. The second effect from which he proves, as he admonishes, that the authors of divisions are to be marked and shunned, is:—

'They seduce the hearts of men:

'Therefore, they are to be marked and shunned.'

This effect the apostle amplifies—both by the adjunct of the manner of seducing, and by the adjunct of those men whose hearts they seduce. The adjunct of the manner of seducing is—"fair speaking and flattery;" which two things differ in this way: that "fair speaking" is—'the language addressed to others *by the speaker*, enticing them to evil;' while "flattery" is—'our approbation of the language *of others*, whereby, in like manner, we seek to entice them to evil.' These seducers, therefore, seduced the hearts of men, both by speaking what was agreeable to those whom they seduced, and by approving what they spoke themselves; both contrary to his doctrine. The adjunct of those who were seduced is indicated by the apostle when he says, that they were—"(men) without malice."* In 2 Pet. ii. 3, these persons are called—'professors of the gospel:' for, addressing such, the apostle says—that those seducers, "through covetousness, would, with feigned words, make merchandise of" these same professors; and in the 20th verse of the same chap. they are called—such as "have escaped the pollutions of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Sa-

* *Minimè malorum.*

viour Jesus Christ, and, being overcome, are again entangled in the same," so that "their latter state is worse than the former." These "(men) without malice," therefore, are—'hypocrites, who profess the gospel in such a way, that they both deceive others, and are deceived concerning themselves and their own condition;' whom our Lord compares to 'the sprouting seed, which forthwith withering, as soon as the sun has arisen, never attains to the harvest of the sons of God.'

19. "For your obedience has spread abroad to all." The second reason of the admonition is taken from the adjunct of the fame of the obedience which they had hitherto rendered to the gospel. The force of the argument from this is—that the more celebrated their obedience had been, the more notorious, and attended with the greater cause of offence, would be their declension and apostacy to the side of the schismatic. The apostle therefore here thus reasons:—

'Those, the obedience rendered by whom to the gospel of peace is celebrated, should, most of all, beware of divisions contrary to the peace of the gospel:

'But the obedience hitherto rendered to the gospel of peace by you who are at Rome, has become celebrated and known to all:

'Therefore you, above others, should beware of divisions, and shun the authors of divisions.'

The proposition is obvious. The assumption is expressed in the commencement of this 19th verse; which, in the words immediately following, the apostle amplifies by the adjunct of 'his joy,' as the effect and fruit of their celebrated obedience:—"I rejoice therefore concerning you." "But I would have you," &c. This is an epanorthosis and correction, as it were, of his joy, whereby he obviates an objection which might arise from that profession of his joy:—'if we are such as to afford you joy, to what purpose this admonition? why apply the spur to the running horse?' He replies by a contrast:—'Although I rejoice concerning you, yet it is in such a way, that I would have you continue both wise and

innocent.' He therefore corrects his profession of joy by the desire which remained and continued with him, that the subject-matter of his joy from them should continue; and this he comprises in two particulars:—"wisdom," and "innocence." Each of these the apostle illustrates, and in a manner defines, by their subjects: he requires "wisdom" in "what is good;" "innocence (from guilt)" in "what is evil." If, therefore, you wish to define them: "wisdom" is—'the science of walking with God in that which is good;' while "innocence" is—'freedom from the deeds and guilt of those who walk in that which is evil:' both of which definitions the apostle elsewhere expresses in a few words, when he recommends to the Church 'to walk in the spirit,' and 'not to care for the lusts of the flesh, so as to fulfil them' (chap. viii. 1; xiii. 14).

20. Now comes the second part of the conclusion of the first kind of salutations, or the prayer put up for them by the apostle; which consists of two parts: the one being a request against an enemy; the other a request for the presence of God: in which two requests he briefly comprises whatever is advantageous for them, and whatever is necessary to carry them forward and sustain them during the continuance of their warfare, and on to its close. "And may the God of peace bruise Satan under your feet shortly." The enemy he denominates—"Satan;" and in the single mention of him, he includes all the enemies of the Church: for all who annoy the Church are—either Satan himself, or his emissaries; as appears from the first denunciation of spiritual war, in which it is said that 'the serpent,' and 'the seed of the serpent,' are those, and all those, who should be enemies to, or indulge enmity against that particular 'woman,' namely, the Church of God, and 'her seed,' both the first-born, and the rest in him. The first request therefore is:—'may God tread and put under your feet, the serpent and his seed, viz., Satan, and all who, being his emissaries, are your enemies.' This request is founded on the promise made to the first-born of the woman—"sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" which promise the apostle here extends, in the

first-born, to the rest of her seed, and prays:—'that, as God has put Satan under Christ, so he may put him under those who are in Christ; so that Satan with his emissaries, may be made the footstool of the saints of God.' This is the first request; for the understanding of which, the following things must be observed in the words of the apostle. First, that by "Satan" he especially intends 'the authors of divisions,' as the chief ministers of Satan, and sent by him into the Church; and this he does after the example of his Lord: for since he addressed Peter, giving perverse counsel, by the name of 'Satan' (Matt. xvi. 23); much more might the apostle style false brethren, perversely perverting the Church, by that name. And this he does most wisely; and on two accounts; for in the first place, by the mention of Satan, he stirs up the saints to whom he writes, to beware of these authors of divisions and false brethren who urged that Moses and his ceremonies must be combined with faith in order to salvation, not less than they would beware of the devil himself; and in the second place, he wisely avoids being accused by these same false brethren, who, although in this request he was praying directly against them, would be unable to lay it to his charge. In the second place, we must observe that, in this prayer, he denominates the God of the Church—"the God of (her) peace;" and that too most wisely: for he thus shews the Roman Church that they could not give place to the authors of divisions, as the Corinthian Church had done, without losing the peace which they had enjoyed in God, as had happened in the case of the Corinthian church; which, on the reception of the false brethren, had been filled with divisions, and especially in that department of the ministry which was the chief token of their peace in the Lord, namely, in the administration of the Lord's Supper. In the third place, we must observe the adjunct of the time; the apostle prays—'that God may tread Satan under their feet,' and that—"shortly:" by which adjunct of the time, he both shews his own zeal for the deliverance of the Church of Christ from so dangerous a pest as these false brethren and authors of division; and besides, consoles them with the expectation of deliverance

about to come to them immediately, as that which he himself requested in faith, and assuredly expected from his God in Christ. "The grace of our Lord," &c. This is the second part of his prayer; he implores "grace" for them, as the armour of God for resisting evil, and opposing the authors of division. By the term "grace," therefore, I understand here—'every thing wherewith God furnishes and arms his people, for resisting evil, and the authors of evil:' and he calls it "grace," because, just as the benefits of peace are given gratuitously in the Lord of grace; so this celestial armour itself, or furnishing of strength against impending evils, is gratuitous, and in Jesus Christ. "Amen." He amplifies both parts of his prayer by a new and joint request; wherein he prays—'that both the petitions which he has already uttered, may be heard and ratified by God in Christ.'

21. Next come the salutations of the second kind; in which others besides Paul salute the Roman Church, in three verses: and these salutations the apostle, in like manner, winds up, in the 24th and three following verses, with prayer, and giving of thanks.

Verse 24th is the prayer; in which he supplicates the grace of Christ for all the Romans to whom he writes.

The three following verses contain the doxology.

Verse 25th is a description of God from his great "power;" which is—'the power of establishing in faith:' for God alone, who gives faith, and works it in our hearts, can establish the same. This 'power' is amplified by its subject—"you;" and its instrument—"the gospel." 'The gospel' is illustrated by the different dispensations: at first, the mystery of the gospel was 'hidden and concealed;' which is shewn by the adjunct of the time—'from the beginning of the world to the time of the New Testament:' then, under the New Testament, it was 'manifested and revealed.' This 'revelation,' again, is explained by its object—"to all na-

tions;" its instrument—"through the scriptures of the prophets;" and its end—"for the obedience of faith."

Verse 27 is the doxology itself:—"Glory be to God." Moreover, God is described by his proper adjunct—"the only wise." And that this giving of thanks may be acceptable to God, it is offered in the name of the Mediator: for no prayers, and no thanksgivings, can be acceptable to God, except through Christ the Mediator. Lastly, this doxology is sealed with the word—"Amen," which indicates 'faith;' or 'desire:'—'so it shall be;' or 'so I wish it may be.'

COMMENTARIUS

IN

DIVINAM PAULI EPISTOLAM

AD ROMANOS

AUCTORE

ANDREA MELVINO, SCOTO:

NUNC PRIMUM E CODICE MANU SCRIPTO EDITUS

CURIS

GUILHELMI LINDSAY ALEXANDER, S.T.D.

EDINBURGI:

SUMPTIBUS SOCIETATIS WODROVENSIS.

MDCCCXLIX

EDITORIS PRAEFATUM.

Tenes in manu, L. B. opusculum quod, sive nomen famamque auctoris, sive libri ipsius materiam ac rationem spectes, non sine summa observantia recipere possis. Nemo est, minima quidem ex parte literis imbutus, qui nesciat quantum honoris sibi acquisiverit, quantum boni in patriam contulerit Melvinus ille. Knoxium τὸν πάνυ excipiens, opus reformandae ecclesiae a viro illo spectatissimo inceptum fideliter promovit, vel, ut potius dicam, annuente Deo confecit. Optime etiam de re litteraria apud nostrates meruit, tum studiis juvenum dirigendis, tum suis diligenter fideliterque persequendis. Ingenii fuit eximii, indolis haud minus subtilis quam sagacis, et, quum scientiam omnigenam vehementer affectabat, tantos doctrinae thesauros accumulavit, ut, quod ad mentem attinet, inter ditissimos sui temporis annumerari debeat. Nihil tamen ipse tanti aestimavit quanti sacras literas divinamque scientiam; quamobrem in has praecipue incumbebat, et humanam doctrinam Theologiae ancillam fieri sedulo studebat.

Dum officio Rectoris ac Professoris in Academia Andreapolitana fungebatur, discipulis in Epistolas Beati Pauli praelegere

solebat; inter quas quis nescit quantum emineat, tam gravitate materiae quam ratiocinationis acumine atque vi, Epistola ad Romanos? Huic igitur operam dedit praecipuam Melvinus; nec sine fructu; multis enim Apostoli locis lucem affusit, et non solum auditores doctrina ac pietate sua quotidie delectavit, sed etiam multorum adolescentium ingenuorum mentes literis sacris informavit, ipsosque ad praedicandum evangelium optime munitos emisit. Talis viri quis non admiratur ingenium ac labores? quis non tanti ingenii, tantorumque laborum fructus aliquot recipere cuperet?

Praelectionum Melvini nescio an exstent ulla vestigia propria manu scripta; omnia suspicor abolevisse aetatem invidam. Discipulis autem commentarios suos commodare solebat, ut, ipsissima magistri verba describentes, penitiorem rerum, de quibus coram eis disseruisset, cognitionem secum deportarent. Inter alios, peregrinus quidam, nomine Daniel Demetrius, qui Melvini audiendi causa in Scotiam venerat, commentarios ejus in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos transcripsit, auctoris, ut ipse testatur, exemplar secutus. Hoc opus Demetrii, ad nostrum usque tempus servatum, hodie penes est virum humanissimum, Davidem Laing, Armigerum, qui, pro solita sua liberalitate, concilio Societatis Wodrovensis facillime concessit ut librum sub prelo ponerent, et publici juris facerent. Codex paginas centum viginti et unam *in quarto*, ut dicunt, sed minoris formae continet; scripturam lectu facillimam atque singularis elegantiae exhibet; et si menda perpauca parvique momenti, hic illic sparsa, excipias, nusquam manu corrigenti opus praebet.

Haud dubito quin omnibus societatis nostrae sociis opusculum

hocce nunc typis editum acceptum futurum sit. In officio fungendo meo maximam adhibui curam ut quam accuratissime prodeat. Faxit Deus ut sit haec nostra cura frugifera, utque hoc servi sui eminentissimi opus, tandem post tot annos in lucem proditum, honori suo inserviat. Illi soli vivo veroque Deo sit laus, gloria et imperium in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Dabam villa mea prope Musselburgum
ipsis Nonis Julii MDCCCXLIX.

COMMENTARIUS, &c.

ARGUMENTUM EPISTOLAE.

Haec epistola, summam Christianismi complexa, constat medio et extremis; extrema duo, prius et posterius: Prius extremum dicatur dicendi causa προγραφή, praescriptio; Posterius ἐπιγραφή, quasi postscriptio; Medium vero γραφή, scriptio ipsa; quemadmodum πρόλογος, λόγος, ἐπίλογος, sive proœmium aut exordium, oratio, peroratio in orationibus apud oratores. Sive istis, sive aliis utamur nominibus, res ipsa teneatur, et extrema cum mediis, et media cum extremis vincta inter se et colligata esse intelligantur. Προγραφή sive praescriptio duabus constat partibus, nimirum priore, qua significatur Pauli munus et officium apostolicum erga Romanos; posteriore, qua significantur Pauli studium, ac benevolentia erga Romanos apostolica: ad illam spectant nomina pluribus argumentis illustrata, ad hanc εὐλογία, fausta imprecatio bonorum omnium spiritualium a Deo Patre in Christo filio, [et] εὐχαριστία, gratiarum actio, qua ob fidei Romanorum celebritatem Deus in Christo, fidei autor, celebratur: quae celebratio probatur studio augendi, et confirmandi fidem Romanorum. Et hoc studium a studio communicandi Spiritualis boni, et hoc rursum studium a proposito et studio invisendi Romanos. Et hoc demum studio facultatis seu veniae divinitus concedendae, et viae prosperioris ex Dei voluntate, quae duo precum assiduitate illustrantur, atque haec tandem religiosa asseveratione, et jurisjurandi sanctitate: Vnde a primo ad ultimum colligi potest, valde laetari apostolus de felici Romanorum statu; qui eum tam vehementer cupiat opera sua auctum, et confirmatum, idque ex officio.

Sequitur γραφὴ sive scriptio ipsa bimembris, nimirum διδασκαλία, doctrina, et παράκλησις, adhortatio: Διδασκαλία sive μέρος διδασκαλικὸν, pars doctrinam explicans, est de salute in Christo per Evangelium conferenda, quam probat a saluis causa, quae est vera justitia; haec autem Evangelica non legalis, Dei, sive divina, non humana, fidei non operum; quia legalis, humana, operum justitia omnis, sive Gentium, sive Judaeorum, ad legem tum naturae, tum Mosis collata atque exacta, est mera injustitia, omnes homines tam Gentes, quam Judaeos condemnationi divinae subiiciens; a cap. i. 17, ad iii. 21. Justitia Evangelica, Dei, et fidei, communis Judaeis et Gentibus προληπτικῶς insertur vv. 21, 22, 23. Illustratur justitia, quà Dei est, testimonio duplici, altero ex lege, altero ex prophetis vv. 24, 25, 26, quà fidei, vv. 27, 28, qua communis 29, 30. Legem non evertere docetur ult. v. Illustratur haec Evangelica, Dei, fidei et communis justitia exemplo Abrahami, communis omnium justificandorum patris, et testimonio duplici, altero ex lege, altero ex prophetis cap. iv. Vnde infertur salus quatuor capitibus v. vi. vii. viii. Et quia duplex justitia, altera causa salutis, altera testimonium, a justitia fidei, quae causa est, infertur cap. v. salutis spes certa ex pace cum Deo et reconciliatione quae est effectum et comes justificationis fidei: Ad salutem, eiusque certitudinem tam illustrandam quam confirmandam spectat triplex gloriatio, una sub spe gloriae Dei, quae aliud nihil est, quam salutis certitudo; altera in afflictionibus, qua augetur patientia; et, aucta patientia, augetur experientia, qua aucta augetur spes et confirmatur, quae non est fallax, aut * cum Spiritu Sancto tanquam arrhabone obsignetur amor Dei in Christo erga nos, quibus justificandis et reconciliandis eum in mortem exposuit, ut nos justificati et reconciliati a metu mortis liberaremur, et vita aeterna secum perfrueremur atque haec quoque est salutis certitudo: Tertia gloriatio in Deo per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, per quem reconciliationem adepti sumus. Materia gloriandi est justitia per Christum nobis parta, et Dei gratia per Spiritum Sanctum nobis communicata, quae infinitis

* [Hic valde difficilis est scriptio, ita ut quid dicendum vellet auctor haud certe scio; sed fortasse "irrita."]

partibus uberior, et efficacior ad nos justos constituendos, et offerendam nobis vitam aeternam, quam injustitia Adami ad nos injustos constituendos, et mortem promerendam; ac proinde haec omnis collatio Christi cum Adamo ad salutis certitudinem pertinet, sumpta nimirum a causa uberiore et efficaciore per duplicem comparationem tam similium quam imparium. Cum hac justitia, salutis causa, cohaeret altera justitia salutis pignus, quia justificationis testimonium; quippe sanctificatio promanans a morte et resurrectione Christi, qua cum Christo coalescentes in morte et vita illi conformes reddimur morte peccati, et vita justitiae; ad quam exercendam et promovendam duplici similitudine extimulamur, una servitutis et libertatis, unde certitudo salutis gratuitae cap. vi. concluditur: altera coniugii veteris et novi, cum purgatione legis, et defensione legitima, quod non legis vitio, sed peccati maleficio peccatum per legem augeatur. Vnde post gravem luctum concluditur certa victoria ad salutis certitudinem confirmandam. cap. vii., quae toto octavo capite et confirmatur, et illustratur, et amplificatur a sanctificationis et certitudine et plenitudine, illa quidem iam praesente, hac vero tandem futura, quia jam per evangelii auditionem Spiritu Christi vivifico donati sumus, qui caepit in nobis bonum opus Dei, non solum fidei, de qua hic non agitur, sed sanctificationis, liberando hos ex parte a lege peccati et mortis, ut ne nunc quidem dominent in nos, tametsi ex parte detineant quasi captivos; et quod opus caepit, non est intermissurus donec idipsum perficiat ut jus legis in nobis compleatur: Ergo in quibus jus legis divinae tandem complebitur, illi liberati sunt, vel coepti sunt liberari a lege peccati et mortis, et qui liberati a lege peccati et mortis, illos nulla manet condemnatio propter peccatum inhabitans, et mortem inde consequentem. Liberatos a lege peccati et mortis *i. e.* coeptos liberari ex eo constat, quod secundum Spiritum ambulant; et quia ambulant secundum Spiritum, ideo scimus eos in Christo esse, sive in Spiritu esse, sive secundum Spiritum esse: haec enim omnia eodem spectant *i. e.* communione mortis et resurrectionis Christi per Sp. S. participata mortui peccato vivunt justitiae, atque ita Spirituales facti sapiunt quae Spiritus sunt, et ambulant secundum Spiritum,

quod certum est testimonium tum pacis cum Deo et reconciliationis, tum salutis et vitae aeternae: nam ut qui in carne sunt, Deo placere non possunt, in Spiritu esse docent opera Spiritus et secundum Spiritum incessus; et quia in Spiritu sunt, Spiritum Christi et Christum habent incolam; qui Spiritus Christi a Deo, ut Christum excitavit a mortuis, ita vivificabit a peccato et morte plane liberaturus corpora haec, quae nunc peccant, mortalia, et glorificabit cum animis glorificatis coniungenda: Quin et idem Spiritus nos sanctificans, est adoptionis Spiritus obsignans in cordibus nostris affectum Dei erga nos paternum, nostramque adoptionem. Vnde infertur salutis et gloriae aeternae certitudo, ex eo quod filii, ac proinde haeredes Dei, et Christi cohaeredes: Quo spectat illa rerum creatarum, quasi nobiscum, tam sollicita expectatio, quam unanimis συμπάθεια v. 3, ad spem salutis confirmandam, quo spectat et Spiritus Sti. in adversis praesidium, et in precibus ardor et efficacia: Denique huc omnia etiam adversa, atque adeo peccata, ex Dei ordinatione tendunt, ut, nostrae sanctificationis his mediis promovendae certiores facti, certo sciamus ex aeterno Dei proposito et praedestinatione, nos tandem aliquando glorificatum iri, quod apostolus per praeteritum tempus expressit, ἐδόξασε, ad hanc certitudinem salutis confirmandam, quo spectant etiam, Deum nobiscum esse, itaque quid contra nos? Christum filium dedisse nobis, quid negaturus? nos justificasse, quis accusaturus? Christum nobis patronum esse, ergo salus nostra certissima est. Atque haec omnia faciunt, ut Deum redamemus exemplo veteris ecclesiae, Ps. xliv., adeo ut in aerumnis et media morte plus quam victores simus, amore ipsius in nostris animis accenso per Spiritum Sm. sensu illius amoris, quo Deus in Christo est nos ultro prosequutus, quam vim amoris mutui et vinculum indissolubile nulla vis in terra aut caelo, vel hac rerum universitate queat dirimere: hinc rursus ex nostri sanctificatione colligitur salutis certitudo; atque ita ut ex justificatione cap. v. Ita ex sanctificatione cap. vi. 23, cap. vii. 24, 25, cap. viii. 1, 10, 11, 13, 17, 28, 34, et ultimo, colligitur, inquam, salutis certitudo.

Hactenus ergo justitia et salus gratuita in Christo per evangelium

communicata, non legalis, sed evangelica, quam quia Judaei aspernantur, ideo rejecti ex aeterno Dei decreto secundum prophetarum oracula, gentes vero quod evangelium ex gratia amplexae hujus justitiae et salutis evadunt compotes, ex decreto item aeterno Dei, et prophetarum oraculis, capp. ix. et x.; Ubi legali justitiae evangelica opposita describitur, et illustratur Mosis et prophetarum testimoniis, quam justitiam ut Judaei tandem amplexentur, ad tempus rejiciuntur, ut aemulatione gentium provocentur et ipsi, ut catholica ecclesia ex Judaeis et gentibus collecta, universis gratia Dei in Christo servetur, cap. xi.

Hactenus doctrina de justitia et salute tam judaeis quam gentibus communi; sequitur παράκλησις sive παραίνεσις ad vitam sanctam et dignam homine Christiano, tribus capp. xii. xiii. xiv. ad xv. 14. Ac primo ad corporis et animi sanctitatem hortatur in genere, ad divinae voluntatis normam, et temperatam fidei demenso prudentiam, quam singulis ecclesiasticarum functionum muneribus accommodat, ac deinde generalibus omnium Christianorum officiis erga fratres, erga deum, et adversum inimicos 12mo cap. Quae ethica Christiana dici possunt. Tum de officio subditorum erga magistratus, et contra officio magistratuum adversus subditos, cum generali adhortatione ad omne officium alteri praestandum sub generali charitatis commendatione; at tandem ab omni libidinum et irarum intemperie dehortans ad sobrietatem in cibo, et potu, ad castitatem, ab inconcessa et immodica venere, ad mansuetudinem in lenitate et placabilitate hortatur, ac generatim Christum induendum monet 13mo cap. Quae ad politica Christiana referri possunt. Postremo ne firmi fide infirmos in rebus mediis contemnant aut infirmi firmos condemnent, cap. xiv., sed unusquisque non tam sibi, quam aliis placere studeat ad aedificationem, exemplo Christi, qui gentes et Judaeos, secundum promissiones patribus factas et prophetarum praedictiones, veram justitiam exhibito evangelium obtulit in electorum omnium salutem, 15mo cap. ad 14um v.

Atque haec de sanctitate seu vita Christiana, quoad officia erga deum, et homines sive aequales, eosque vel amicos, vel inimicos, sive

inaequales, vel autoritate, vel fide; denique de omnium erga omnes charitatis officio.

Sequitur epistolae pars tertia atque ultima, quam ἐπιγραφήν, aut ἐπίλογον diximus. Ea partim excusatione, partim salutatione constat, a 14mo v. 15mi cap., ad finem 16mi cap. Excusatio duplex, altera libertatis in scribendo, altera dilati adventus; utriusque causam transfert in necessitatem muneris apostolici cujus efficaciam magnificentissime praedicat, pollicitus brevi se Romanos invisurum, requisitis ad hoc eorum precibus. Salutatio duplex, una quasi humanior, altera religiosior: Humaniorem voco salutationem, qua certas personas commendat, commemoratis earum virtutibus, ad eas sancte vel excipiendas, vel imitandas, quibus opponit dissidiorum autores sive ἑτεροδιδασκάλους omni studio fugiendos. Ad hoc genus salutationis spectant nomina sive in genere omnium ecclesiarum, sive in parte singulorum hominum, qui tanquam testes huic epistolae quasi subscribunt, ad veritatem communiter obsignandum.

Salutatio religiosior, aut si placet valedictio, posita est in sancta precatione una atque altera, qua Dei gratiae in Christo Romanos commendat, ac tertia quasi operosiore, mysterio Evangelii alte repetito, qua epistolam claudit.

CAP. I. Ἔλεγχοι.

Exordium epistolae, sive praeloquium ad primi capitis 16. v. (ut dixi) extenditur; nimirum de suo apostolatu, et studio erga Romanos suo ex muneris apostolici fungendi necessitate. Haec duo non satis distincte ab interpretibus explicantur, pleriqui enim periodum primam, quae finienda est v. 7, parte media, ante verba "gratia sit, etc." confundunt cum sequenti periodo, quae altera parte 7mi v. continetur, atque ita totum hoc comprehensum primis 7mis vv. salutationem vocant non levi errore: Cum sint revera duae distinctae (ut dixi) et plenae periodi, quae ad diversas spectant sententias; prior ad descriptionem Apostolatus Paulini erga Romanos, posterior ad salutationem sanctam et apostolicam, qua Paulus Romanis, bona omnia spiritualia adprecatur. Utrobique est verbi ellipsis; in priore γράφει vel ἐπιστέλλει, ut sit indicandi modi: Paulus, &c. Romanis, sive Romae fidelibus scribit. Docetur, enim quis cui scribat, aut mittat hanc epistolam, non quis cui salutem dicat, aut fausta imprecetur. Quae vero nominibus adjiciuntur, faciunt apostolicam erga Romanos autoritatem ex vocatione commendandam, et impetrandam audientiam; adeo ut quae de Evangelio, de Christo, deque Apostolatu dicantur, tres digressiones aut excursus dici non debeant; cum huc spectent vel maxime, nimirum ad Apostolici muneris descriptionem et commendationem; versatur enim in Evangelio praedicando, tanquam in materia quam tractat, et Evangelii subjectum, quasi adaequatum, Christus, ut ab Apostolo hic describitur. Tertium illud de Apostolatu, praecipuum est quod hic agitur. Quare cum haec tria hic describuntur, non excurrit aut digreditur ab eo, quod sibi proposuit agendum, hoc loco, Apostolus; cujus Apostolatum tam Christi, quam Evangelii descriptio, mirum quantum amplificat, imo illustrat dignitatem et naturam maxime, cum ad docilitatem tum ad attentionem com-

parandam. Est autem plena admodum haec periodus, seu comprehensio verborum, quam Graeci *περιβολὴν, λόγον περιοδικὸν, καὶ μεσότητα* appellare consueverunt. In posteriori autem periodo deest verbum optandi modi aut *πληθυνθείη* (quod expressum legitur apud Petrum in utriusque Epistolae suae exordio), vel verbum substantivum, cuius valde frequens est ellipsis, vel aliquod aliud verbum, modo sententiae conveniat. Profecto vel grammatica ipsa non patitur tam absurdam Syntaxin:—Paulus Romanis, &c., gratia sit vobis; multo minus patitur vel logica, vel theologia sententiarum tam diversarum, quam divinarum confusionem; cum prior advocationis et muneris commendationem; posterior ad studium Apostoli in fungendo munere pertineat. Precari enim fausta omnia Romanis benevolentiae significationem habet, non minus quam gratias agere Deo super illorum fide, &c. Cuius benevolentiae et studii erga Romanos Apostolici commendatio, altera praefationis parte ut dixi continetur.

V. 1. *Δοῦλος.* Servum se Christi vocat, non tam eo sensu, quo Christiani omnes sancti vocantur, per vocationem (ut quidam loquuntur) generalem, sed muneris publici notionem habet nomen hic servi, ut inscriptione Ps. xviii. et xxxvi., David Dei servus dicitur, et magistratus *διάκονος* et *λειτουργος θεοῦ*, Rom. xiii. 4 et 6; servus *i. e.* publicum munus gerens; Magistratus quidem in republica civile, Paulus vero spirituale in Ecclesia. Nam qui rempublicam cum ecclesia confundunt, de utroque statu tam civili quam ecclesiastico pessime merentur, suamque produnt non minus impietatem, quam maximarum rerum ignorationem. Quin et *ἀφορισμὸς* a vocatione videtur distinguendus, ut hic distinguit apostolus; et ad Galatas (i. 15,) dicit divinitus separatum se ab utero matris (*ὁ ἀφορίσας μὲ*:) At nemo sanus dixerit Paulum vocatum ab utero matris; et Act. xiii. 2. distinguit Spiritus Sanctus inter separationem et vocationem Pauli, *ἀφορίσατέ δὲ μοὶ τὸν Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὁ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς.* Itaque vocatio distingui debet in privatam et publicam. Publica rursus in civilem, et ecclesiasticam, sed de hoc satis.

V. 9. *Μάρτυς γάρ*, &c. Non tam occupat, ut mihi videtur objectionem dilati adventus, quam probat quod proxime posuit de sua gratiarum actione, qua gratulatur Romanis celebritatem fidei. Nam si studiosus est augendæ illorum fidei, tam præsentia quam opera sua, sane non potest non lætari de illorum fide, et si precatur assidue, ut sibi concedatur illa opportunitas illos ea de causa invisendi, quidni etiam gratias agat Deo, etc., de illorum felici conditione? Causam vero dilati adventus rejecit in cap. xv., quod hic non tam commode tractaretur, ubi totus est in significatione studii sui, quod declarat cum fausta precatione, v. 7, tum sancta gratulatione, v. 8. Sed etiam huius gratulationis confirmatione, idque, tam studio, v. 11, quam proposito, v. 13, invisendi Romanos, et coram evangelizandi; ut omittam mentionem illam Romanorum, quam facit in agendis Deo gratiis perpetuam (sic enim distinguo illud *ἀδιαλείπτως* et *πάντοτε*, ut hoc ad participium *δεόμενος ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν*, illud vero ad mentionem *ἐν τῷ εὐχαριστεῖν* referam, ita ut participium *δεόμενος* causam includat mentionis illius: Ut qui rogem.) Quod quia occupatus alibi in munere fungendo, et a Spiritu Sancto distentus præstare non potest, absens facit per literas, quod præsens facere maximopere vellet.

V. 10. Defectum aut *ἔλλειψιν* nullam video; neque enim constructio erit insolens, aut absurda sententia, si participium *δεόμενος* cum verbo *ἐλθεῖν* componatur, *i.e.*, Rogans, ut qui rogem, vel dum rogo ut veniam ad vos.

V. 12. *Τοῦτο δὲ ἐστι*. Mitigat asperitatem verbi *στηριχθῆναι*, modesta interpretatione, ut confirmationis loco cohortationem, aut consolationem, eamque communem et mutuam substituat. Ideoque minus recte quidam in hunc locum, "Interpretatur (inquit) finem illum, posteriorem non tantum esse, ut ipsi confirmentur, sed etiam, etc." Immo vero quasi revocaret id quod dixerat de confirmatione, quasi nimium arroganter dictum cum illorum contumelia, per interpretationem subjicit verbum mitius, quod minus offendat, et in meliorem partem accipiatur facilius.

V. 15. Οὕτω. Non tam conclusionis quam similitudinis in apodosi nota, cuius relativum καθῶς in probasi praetermisit, fortasse propter ambiguitatem, ne scilicet videretur extenuare nexum aeris alieni, quo se obligatum intelligi voluit maxime; vel quia posuerat in superiore sententia καθῶς, sine eo quod ex adverso respondet redditivo οὕτος, idque brevitatis causa, cuiusmodi multae ellipses passim occurrunt in Hebraismo, tum alibi, tum in Proverbiis Solomonis, praesertim ubi similia aut dissimilia aut dissentanea inter se conferuntur.

Nunc vero ut tota hujus Epistola praescriptio sit illustrior, in summa tenendum duabus eam partibus contineri, alteram in nominibus Pauli et Romanorum, et in eorundem illustratione positam, ad muneris Apostolici dignitatem commendandam, et Romanorum impetrandam auscultationem, sex primis versibus, et septimi parte priore: Alteram vero reliqua septimi parte et ceteris sequentibus ad v. 16, studium et benevolentiam Pauli erga Romanos in fungendo munere Apostolico Romanis commendare. Ad priorem spectat primo servi nomen ad Christum Dominum relationem habens, cui verbo subest hic notio spiritualis et publicae servitutis, quae Paulum differre facit non solum a Magistratu civili, qui Dei servus proprie magis quam Christi dicitur, verum etiam ab aliis Christianis, qui cum privati sint, immunes sunt ab omni publico in Ecclesia munere: Nihilo secius communis hic honor Paulo cum omnibus aliis publicum in Ecclesia munus gerentibus. Cum titulo honorifico subjicitur secundo loco specialis ad Apostolatum vocatio, summus sub Rege Christo in Ecclesia honos, ad quem honorem (Act ix.) a Christo vocatum ex Christi verbis constat. Tertio loco, separatus dicitur, auctore Spiritu Sancto, per Antiochenum Presbyterium Paulus (ut ego interpretor hunc locum) ad Evangelium inter Gentes praedicandum, (Act. xiii.) ad quod opus divinitus antea vocatum testatur oraculum Spiritus Sancti ibidem. Nec excludo ἀφορισμὸν ἀπὸ τῆς κοιλίας, (Gal. i.), ex aeterno Dei decreto, vide Jer. i. Quarto loco est Evangelium, in quo promulgando, hujus servi Christi, vocatione Apostoli, et a Spiritu Sancto praecipue cum Barnaba ab aliis Apostolis separati, et ad gentes missi, est omnis occupa-

tio : Cujus Evangelii autor Deus, antiquitas jam inde a lapsu hominis, natura in gratuita pollicitatione, sanctitas, et certitudo prophetis testibus omni exceptione majoribus et sanctarum literarum tabulis authenticis, commendatur : describiturque materia Evangelio subiecta, quippe filius Dei, cuius persona una ab aeterno genita ; naturae duae : humana, Davidicae stirpis virgine orta, anno M. 3927; divina, per se aeterna, verum ἐν πληρώματι καιρῶν, anno 3960, declarata mundo, et manifestata resuscitato in vitam corpore, quod expositum erat in mortem crucis execrabilem, idque virtute sua, qua Spiritus est sanctimoniae omnis autor in angelis et hominibus, atque adeo ipsa sanctitas, naturam assumtam non solum in articulo conceptus purissime sanctificans, sed etiam vita post mortem rediviva plenissime glorificans ; unde filius Dei, Deus et homo, idoneus nobis Servator, unctus Propheta, Sacerdos, Rex et Dominus noster, debellato peccato et morte, et triumphatis hostibus, coelum ingressus ad dextram majestatis in solio consedit, donis et muneribus inde Ecclesiam cumulans Ephes. iv. Nec aliunde, aut ab alio Paulus vocatus accepit gratis Apostolatum, pro Christi nomine et ad gloriam Christi fidem, gentibus in justitiam cum sanctitate, et salutem per evangelium communicando, legatione functurus, non tam inter Judaeos, quam inter omnes Gentes, quarum ex numero est Romana omnium nobilissima, non tam sede et domicilio, famaque imperii in omnes gentes constituti, quam Christi vocatione, qua plerique non solum vocati a Christi Apostolis, sed et ad Christi communionem vocati, non dicantur magis cognomento, quam sint reapse, Christiani. Paulus, inquam, talis tantusque Christi ad gentem etiam Romanam Apostolus scribit Epistolam hanc, vobis quotquot Romae estis. Deo aeternum singulariter adamati, sive iam vocati in Christi societatem sitis sive porro vocandi ad vitam caste sanoteque degendam, in spem gloriae sempiternae. Atque hactenus pars procemii prima, uno verborum ambitu comprehensa, et rudiore a nobis penicillo adumbrata : In qua liceat videre quis, cui, quid, qua de re, et cur scribat ; et cur sit, quod scribit, attente legendum, et avide amplectendum : Quae dum summa rerum tractandarum fastigia delibat, earum et divina majes-

tate attentionem, et illustri brevitate docilitatem comparat; quod facit tersissimis verbis atque sententiis, adeo ut Ciceroniana vis omnis dicendi evanescat in fumos, et, si cum hac conferatur, Demosthenica.

Secunda pars sequitur, de functione muneris Apostolici, in qua est vehementis studii, et singularis erga Romanos benevolentiae luculenta designatio ad mutuam benevolentiam conciliandam. Partes muneris duae, Precatio, et Predicatio. Precatione assidua se hactenus usum esse, praedicatione vero Evangelii coram uti maxime voluisse, et qua potest nunc uti. Precationis partes duae, votum, sive optatio vulgo salutatio, et εὐχαριστία, sive gratiarum actio; haec Deo patri per Christum pro singulari beneficio fidei Christianae Romanis datae redditur; illa a Deo Patre et Domino Iesu Christo petit omnia bona spiritualia sub gratiae et pacis nominibus communicanda. Observa obiter hic et in omnibus aliis Paulinis exordiis ἔλλειψιν verbi duplicam, alteram in nominibus, alteram in salutatione (ut dictum est) ad affectum animi ardentiorem significandum. In εὐχαριστίᾳ fidem Romanorum in toto mundo celebrem esse synecdochice dicitur, cum in Ecclesiis tantum Christianis ea praedicaret, nisi mavis, propter Imperii Romani in orbe terrarum amplitudinem, divulgatam inter alienas adhuc a Christo Gentes Romanorum conversionem; sed neque hoc sensu aberit synecdoche.

Quaeri potest, quis primus fundavit Romanam Ecclesiam, et cur Apostolus tantopere optarit Romam venire, qui super alieno fundamento noluerit libenter aedificare, infra c. xv. v. 20. Quod ad prius, verisimile aut unum aut plures eorum, quos nominat in calce Epistolae, et quorum virtutes commendat Romanis imitandas;* haud scio an praecipue Andronicus, et Junias, quos et insignes inter Apostolos esse, et ante se in Christo fuisse dicit, prima Romanae Ecclesiae fundamenta jecerint. De Petro nihil neque hic (quem sine contumelia, si Romae fuisset, praeterire non potuit) neque alibi usquam in sacris literis, quod faciat ad Petri cathedram in perforatam Pontificis Romani sedem transformandam; sed haec

* [Supp. *hanc ecclesiam fundavisse;* quibus aut talibus omissis ἀνακολουθῶς scripsit auctor.]

alias. Ad alteram quaestionem commodius postea cap. XV. respondebitur.

Εὐχαριστίαν probat, et gratulationem suam ob fidem Romanorum, testimonio divino, et sacrosancta jurisjurandi religione, qua Deum in testem advocat, sinceritatis suae conscium, et integritatis in Evangelio filii sui administrando, se Romanorum mentionem indesinenter facere, nimirum in agendis Deo gratiis pro collatis in eos beneficiis, ut supra exposui, quod probat etiam precum assiduitate, qua utitur, ut tandem expleat desiderium invisendi Romanos suum, ad doctrinae communicationem, ut supra dictum est; ad quam priusquam accedam, obiter ponenda quaestio, cur cum et patris et filii meminerit in petitione beneficiorum, et gratiarum actione pro acceptis beneficiis, atque adeo in jurejurando, cur, inquam, nulla mentio facta ab eo est Spiritus Sancti? An quia unus idemque Spiritus utriusque, procedens ab utroque, utrique coniunctus intelligatur? cuius afflatu Paulus καὶ εὔχεται καὶ εὐχαριστεῖ, καὶ λατρεύει καὶ προσεύχεται, et per quem pater in filio et exoratur, et confert omnia beneficia? hic est. Atque haec de precatione; doctrina sequitur. Ad functionem muneris Apostolici in doctrina administranda pertinet duplex ratio, altera inter praesentes viva voce, altera scriptione inter absentes: Prioris oportunitatem ut desideravit hactenus, sic etiam nunc desiderat; quin etiam capto consilio proposuit se in viam dare, ut Romanos eadem de causa inviseret; per illum ergo non stetit, quominus munere suo etiam hac in parte fungeretur. Hujus tam studii, quam propositi sui Romanos videndi finem pluribus explanat, nunc doni spiritualis communicandi, nunc confirmandi, nunc consolandi, aut cohortandi, denique fructus habendi, aut percipiendi verbis: quae omnia ad doctrinae tradendae usum et fructum pertinent, quanquam diversa ratione, ut est alias expositum.

V. 13. (Vt fructum aliquem habeam.)

Modeste *aliquem* dixit, ut supra συμπαρακληθῆναι, et signate, *habeam* viz. quaesitum studio, et labore meo partum ac quodammodo mihi apostolo debitum inter vos, non secus atque inter alias gentes, quibus multum profuit mea praedicatio. Argumentum a parium

aut similium comparatione; altera similitudinis nota οὕτω ἐλλείπει hic ἐν ἀποδόσει, ut statim postea in προτάσει καθώς.

V. 14. Alterum argumentum ab adjuncto aere alieno, quo obstringitur omnibus omnium gentium ordinibus (sive graeci sint, sive barbari: sive sapientes (ut Gallorum Druides, Aegyptiorum sacerdotes, Persarum Magi, Chaldaeorum Genethliaci, Indorum Brachmanes et Gymnosophistae) sive insipientes et Idiotae, etc.) quod itidem illustrat similium aut parium contentione, qua suam expromptam alacritatem ad praedicandum Romanis Evangelium arguit, τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ addit, quo indicet scripto se nunc facere, quod viva voce non potest. Atque haec est altera doctrinae tradendae ratio apostolica per scripturam Novi Testamenti; qua se profitetur εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, ne quis putet assa voce solummodo praedicari evangelium. Atque haec de functione muneris apostolici in precatione et doctrina; in quibus proponendis affectus paterni studium ardentissimum erga Romanos omni ex parte se effundit: huc spectat votum, quo bona omnia Romanis optat divinitus; huc εὐχαριστία, qua gratias agit Deo pro Romanorum fide; huc item spectat huius gratulationis confirmatio omnis a perpetua mensione Romanorum, et assidua postulatione in omni precum genere.

Quid numinis divini ad hoc obsignandum advocata in testimonium conscientia? Quid desiderium vehemens et diuturnum invisendi Romanos? Quid propositum constans, ac saepe repetitum ad utilitatem et solatium Romanorum? ut nihil dicam de ea, qua Romanos prosequitur dignatione, dum se quamvis apostolum usque adeo demittit, ut sibi Romanos in spiritualium donorum communicandorum facultate tantum non exaequet, et quod a se profecturum in rem eorum sit, in beneficii apud se collocati locum ducat, nedum ut de illis bene merendo sibi consulat, aut eos sibi hoc nomine devinctos putet, ut quibus se obaeratum ultro profiteatur. Observentur hic verba τὸ ἦθη simul et mores amabiles supra modum, et φιλανθρωπίαν dulcissimam apostolica gravitate temperatam exprimentia divinitus. Et ut hunc locum concludam, affectus ad benevolentiam conciliandam mitiores spirituali fervore, et divino artificio pruden-

tissime, simul et sanctissime tractantur, adeo ut ferreus sit, ac prorsus inhumanus, qui tantum, tam sanctum amorem ultro se offerentem non redamet. Atque haec de utraque exordii parte, totoque exordio, quod accuratum adeo et elaboratum est, ut nihil quicquam sit eius generis apud ullum scriptorem cum eo comparandum. Sequitur pars secunda et epistolae praecipua, quae disputatione de doctrina et adhortatione ad vitam et mores Christiano homine dignos continetur.

V. 16. Gloriosum sibi ducit apostolus Evangelii praeconium, ut cujus virtus sit plane divina, et quibusvis hominibus absque ullo gentium discrimine salutaris; quamobrem apud Esaiam brachium Dei vocatur. Hic disceptanda quaestio de statu huius epistolae, sitne salus per Evangelium an justitia ex fide conferenda? Omnino est gratuita in Christo salus, ad quam probandam tam justificationis, quam sanctificationis doctrina omnis affertur: Est enim Evangelium λόγος σωτηρίας, et Christus in Evangelio σωτήρ, nec est aliud sub caelo nomen salutare, et apostolus expromptam suam ad Evangelizandum alacritatem, v. 15, professus est: Quin et res ipsa docet, tam hac propositione 16 ver. habetur, cujus probandae causa fidei justitia 17, abducitur, quam tota subsequens disputatio, et in primis conclusio de certitudine salutis 5, 6, 7, et 8. capp. tum ex justificatione, tum etiam ex sanctificatione saepius illata. Huc spectant etiam παραινέσεις ad vitae sanctimoniam variae et multiplices, atque adeo de aeterna praedestinatione doctrina iam inde ab arcanis Dei consiliis alte repetita, et uno verbo dicam corde creditur ad iustitiam, ore fit confessio ad salutem; ut mirum videri possit, quid plerisque interpretibus in mentem venerit, ut justitiae primas tribuerint; cum de ea hic non nisi salutis causa agatur, et hanc ex illa concludat, sitque rerum expetendarum ultimum atque extremum salus aeterna, cuius causa virtus omnis, ceteraque omnia, atque adeo justitia expetitur. Deum semper excipio, cuius gloria est tanto magis expetenda, quanto ipse est nobis, rebusque omnibus creatis ulterior finis ac praestabilior. Hic meminisse operae pretium est differentiae illius quam tractat Apostolus 2 Cor. iii. inter

legem et Evangelium: illa mortis, hoc salutis ministerium dicitur. Intellige igitur Paulum detrahere legi, quod hic tribuit Evangelio; tribuit autem potentiam salutis conferendae ex justitia fidei, quam et ipsum confert; Legis vero ἀδυναμίαν, cum ad justificationem, tum ad sanctificationem luculente demonstrat, ac proinde neque ad salutem valere necessario colligit. Salus igitur non ex lege, sed ex Evangelio quibusvis hominibus quaerenda. Atque haec de statu epistolae.

Probatur autem salus per Evangelium conferri quatuor primis capp. et concluditur, c. v. Ex sanctificatione vero, capp. vi. vii., eadem confirmatur.

V. 17. Ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν. Exponi solent haec verba de fide indies augescente, cui interpretationi suffragari putatur unus, atque alter locus quoad phrasin, ut vulgo aestimatur; ex posteriore ad Cor. cap. iii., v. ult. ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν, adducitur; verum, cum bona optimorum virorum venia, liceat nobis, et verbis et argumento magis congruentem interpretationem afferre. Loquitur ibi Apostolus de ministerio Evangelico, cuius administri sunt Apostoli, non velata facie, ut Moses, sed retecta; non splendorem evanidum inde emicantem, sed immensam Dei gloriam in Christi facie refulgentem; non tabulis saxeis, quibus insculpta occidens litera, sed tabulis cordis mollibus, ut est caro, quibus lex Jehovae inscribitur; non legis ministerio, sed Evangelii praedicatione tanquam in speculo conspiciendam repraesentantes: Cuius gloriae imagine transformantur auditores, ut et ipsi quoque Christo glorioso conformentur, ducta nimirum imagine a gloria, quae est in Christi facie, ad gloriam auditoribus imprimendam, idque, non ministrorum vi, sed Domini, qui Spiritus est, virtute spirituali. Itaque duplex hic gloria, quarum altera alterius causa est; nimirum ea quae est Christi, relucens in praedicatione Evangelii, causa est gloriae in auditoribus, sicuti gemmae scriptura sui imaginem cerae imprimit, et causa est impressae in cera figurae conformis.

Ergo hoc nihil ad eiusdem in eodem incrementum. Multo minus ad rem facit καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν, 2 Cor. iv. 17. Quum

et verba ipsa excessum significent, et propositio sit alia, atque alius modi. Superest ut nostram interpretationem, vel Pauli potius mentem, illustremus; nam ut nusquam alibi in eam sententiam sic loquitur Apostolus, ita fidei incrementum esset hoc loco ἀπροσδιόνυσον. Fatentur interpretes de justitia ex fide hoc v. 17, agi per Evangelium conferenda; necesse est ergo, ut justitia Dei sit ex fide justitia, ex Pauli sensu et verbis hoc loco, quod non negant interpretes, ut sit constructio δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἡ ἐκ πιστεως, κατ' ἔλλειψιν articuli Rom. ix. 30, et x. 6, ut divina humanae, fidei justitia operum justitiae opponi intelligatur, et Evangelium legi, sive justitia Evangelica legali. Superest ergo quid sit εἰς πίστιν explicare. Superiori versu dixit εἰς σωτηρίαν, quod quid sit nemo dubitat. Cur magis hic haerendum? annon εἰς πίστιν, significabit *in* vel *ad* fidem? ut paulo supra εἰς σωτηρίαν, in vel ad salutem. Sensus ergo est et verborum constructio, Justitia Dei, quae est ex fide, revelatur in Evangelio, vel per Evangelium, in fidem, vel ad fidem, ut sit hic finis proximus et effectum propinquissimum efficacis patefactionis Evangelii, viz., fidei ingeneratio in audientium mentibus. Fides ingenerata prehendit tanquam manu justitiam Dei, quae est ex fide, atque hoc est alterum effectum praedicati Evangelii: confert ergo revelatum Evangelium primo fidem, deinde per fidem justitiam fidei: neque enim nos aliter capere aut obtinere justitiam ex fide, vel fidei justitiam possumus, quam ingenerata nobis per Evangelium fide; q. d. Apostolus, Evangelium conferendo fidem confert justitiam quae est ex fide: Ergo, Evangelium confert salutem, sive est potentia Dei ad salutem; vel Evangelium est efficax ad fidei justitiam, Ergo et ad salutem. Atque haec Evangelii efficacia ad conferendam justitiam, legis impotentiae, quae est inefficax ad operum justitiam, opponi intelligimus. Vide quae supra in hunc locum scripta sunt. Evangelium ergo tria conferre dicitur, fidem, et fidei justitiam, et ex fidei justitia salutem: quod prophetica sexcentos ante annos praedictione, eaque sanctis prodita literis, confirmatur. "Sicut scriptum est, justus ex fide victurus est." Quibus verbis haec tria in Christi adventu gratis per Evangelium exhibenda praedictum fuit: Nam posteaquam de impietate, et injustitia tam Judaeorum, quam Bar-

barorum Gentium cum Deo expostulasset Propheta 1mo cap. jussus fuit visionem tabulis, quas manu habebat, inscribere literis quasi uncialibus, ut a quovis vel in transcursu legi minimo possint negotio. Visionem vero hanc in *longinquum*, idemque statum et certum tempus rejectam esse monet, quam visionem (inquit) effabitur (supple) Deus, vel Christus venturus termino suo, nimirum tempore praestituto, hoc fuit מועד *κατὰ καιρὸν*; et *ἐν πληρώματι καιρῶν* vocat Apostolus, exactis nimirum non septuaginta modo, sed etiam septies septuaginta annis, sub decursum vitae suae periculum, hoc est לקץ, ad finem, ut triennium vitae Christi ultimum cum semestri ante mortem spatio innuere videatur, quo tempore Christus Evangelium annuntiaturus fuit, qui, ut ait Propheta, non mentietur aut fallet: Si cunctabitur, expecta eum, nam veniendo veniet i.e. certissime veniet; quae verba, quamvis alii ad visionem referant, Apostolus ad Hebr. cap. x. de Christo interpretatur, O *ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ*; Ego utrumque complector, et Evangelium cum Christo, et Christum cum Evangelio. Cujus Evangelii summam programmate publico comprehensam, et tabulis eleganter inscriptam (quae tabulae Evangelicae obscurioribus Mosaicae legis tabulis opponi videntur) his verbis paucissimis complectitur:—Justus ex fide sua, vel eius (i.e. Christi Domini venturi) victurus est: Ubi injustitiae, et impietati omnium hominum, (de qua 1mo cap.) et superbiae, sine *ὑποστολῇ*, ut cum Apostolo ad Hebr. loquar, subductioni ex infidelitate eodem versu opponit justitiam, eamque ex fide, quam vita aeterna consequet et secundum quam justitiam Justus ex fide victurus est; quae justitia neque humana, neque operum justitia potuit esse, cum omnes homines tam domesticos, quam exteros omnis injustitiae reos peregerit coram Deo propheta cap. 1. ut reliqua sit ex oraculo justitia indignis conferenda, ex mera Dei in Christo venturo ad Evangelium exhibendum gratia; ac proinde Dei justitia, eaque ex fide, non ex operibus, ut dixi, per Evangelium non per legem patefacienda, et ut ait Apostolus *νῦν δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη πεφανέρωται*, de hac justitia exhibita disserens, Rom. iii. Itaque haec ejus Justitia, Fides, vita aeterna, sive justitia ex fide, et salus, hac dictione prophetica promittuntur gratis in Christo per

Evangelii revelationem communicanda. Atque ita confirmat Apostolus quod de Evangelio 16 et 17 vv. scribit, quodque proemii initio posuerat, Evangelium fuisse a Deo ante promissum per prophetas in Scripturis sanctis. Viderint igitur illi qui negant Prophetae verbis probari justitiam et salutem per Evangelium conferre: Cum et hoc totum complexum contineatur hoc oraculo, et Apostolus utrumque exposuerit, et subjungat confirmationis causa, non statum quaestionis, ut nonnulli volunt, Prophetae verbis, ut majorem autoritatem habeat oratio, sed divinum testimonium sanctis proditum literis, quasi ex syngrapha, et obsignatis tabulis agere videatur, hoc enim est καθὼς γέγραπται, sicut scriptum est, non exprimendi, aut explicandi tantum sententiam suam causa, verum etiam probandi, propheta teste omni exceptione majore, et tabulis sanctae Scripturae authenticis confirmandi, quod testimonium prophetae ita urget Apostolus, ut non solum in hac Epistola, sed etiam in ea quae est ad Galatas, et ad Hebraeos ponat pro doctrinae suae et Evangelii fundamento: Nec mirum, cum Propheta ipse paulo infra v. 14. eiusdem cap. ii. de cognitione gloriae Jehovae, et benedictionum inde consequentium, instar aquarum in mari, abundantia vaticinet, et v. 20., Jehovam in templo sanctitatis suae, i.e. Deum patrem in Christo per Spiritum sanctificantem praesentia sua Ecclesiam suam collocet. Et cap. iii. in divina illa sua, et incomparabili tephilla καὶ δεήσει, ut loquitur Jacobus, ἐνεργουμένη, v. 17. glorietur gloriatione fidei Evangelicae propter justitiam et salutem Evangelicam verbis plane Evangelicis, sibi verbis singularibus Dei gratiam et pacem in Christo Evangelicam applicans. Verba sunt, "quamvis ficus non efflorescceret, et nullus esset proventus in vitibus, mentiretur opus olivae, et agrorum nullus ederet cibum, abscinderet hostis ab ovili gregem, et nullum esset armentum in bubilibus, Ego tamen in Jehova exultabo, gestiam in Deo salutis meae; Jehova Dominus robur meum, vv. 17-19." Unde videtur Apostolus triplicem fidei gloriationem, 1. sub spe gloriae Dei, 2. in afflictionibus, 3. in Deo per D. Jesum, quinto capite desumpsisse. Nec aliunde aptius videtur sumpta illa injustitiae humanae διατύπωσις, quae est a v. 18. cap. 1. ad finem usque, quam ex 2. cap. huius

prophetiae, post verba illa "Justus ex fide sua vivet," nisi quod ordinem in sceleribus numerandis invertat Apostolus divina quadam prudentia, nam propheta primo de ambitione et superbia, 2°. de rapacitate et avaritia, 3°. de divitate * et truculentia, 4°. de luxu probroso, et nefariis libidinibus ac tandem ultimo loco de impietate et Idolomania, judicia sceleribus analoga tragicis verbis exaggerans: Apostolus vero ab impietate, et injustitia in Deum sive Idolatria exorsus, inde velut e fonte rivulos, vel potius e sentina sordes, omnium flagitiorum et scelerum secundum ultionem divinam tanquam ἀντιμισθίαν deducit, distinctis gradibus tam impietatis in Deum, quam facinorum inde emergentium ex justo Dei judicio, ut triplici in Deum culpae triplex in homines paena irrogetur analoga, ut supra dictum est in hujus loci explicatione; quae omnia non minus ab Apostolo tragice, quam a Propheta exaggerantur, ut utrobique liceat videre picturam hominis extra gratiam in Christo egregie depictam, ac maxime gentium profanarum. In summa praedictionem propheticam Apostolica enarratio luculentissime illustrat, non perullam occupationem, cujusmodi hic nonnulli comminiscuntur, sed confirmationem ejus; quod propositum fuit ab Apostolo de Evangelii efficacia ad veram salutem ex vera justitia subministrandam. Ex quibus omnibus liquido constare potest, quod Petrus de fidei nostrae fine, i.e. salute animarum, scriptum reliquit, 1. Epis. i. 10. περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ἐξεζήτησαν, καὶ ἐξερεύνησαν προφῆται, οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες etc. et v. 12. Οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη, ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς, ἡμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτὰ, ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν, διὰ, etc.

Sequitur altera probatio, cujus principium est a reliquiis lucis naturalis pristinae petitum, nimirum a Dei natura sapientissimi, potentissimi ac justissimi ut cujus perspicaciam nihil latere potest, quantumvis occultum, quod non videat: cujus manus (ut in proverbio est de Regibus) adeo longae sunt, ut eas effugere nemo possit; cujus justitia tanta, ut nullum peccatum relinquat impunitum; cujus denique ἀπροσωπολημψία neque generis, neque gentis, neque personae ullius, quae in externis posita est, ullum respectum habet.

* [Qu. *divitatione.*]

Hoc principium natura notum c. ii. a v. 2. ad 18. adhibetur, et varie illustratur ad omnes homines convincendos, estque propositio demonstrationis, "Judicium Dei est secundum veritatem in eos, qui talia agunt," v. 2. c. ii., i.e. Omnes injusti sunt condemnationi obnoxii; Omnes homines extra Evangelium et Christum, sive in se, et operibus suis considerati, sunt injusti; Ergo omnes homines extra Evangelium coram Deo sunt condemnationi obnoxii, ut qui sint *καὶ ἀναπολόγητοι, καὶ αὐτοκατάκριτοι.* Ass[ertio ?] ejusdem demonstrationis disputatur in genere a v. 18. cap. i. ad finem ejusdem, contra omnes homines, ad quos convincendos lux naturae in mentibus reliqua, et ab iis violata reddit eos *ἀναπολογήτους.* Quod si qui sint, qui se aliis meliores putent, quod alios aut reprehendant, aut damnent, in aliorum vitiis notandis cernuli; * hoc ipso hypocritae alios damnando se ipsi condemnant, quippe eorundem scelerum rei, propter quae alios aut reprehendunt, aut damnant. Tergiversantes citat ad tribunal Dei, justissimi judicis, qui licet ad tempus non pareat modo, sed etiam utibilem se ac beneficum indignis praebeat, tamen contemptum gratiae, qua ad resipiscentiam invitat improbos, tandem summo jure et severissime ulciscetur, et vindicabit in obfirmatos animos, et impoenitentes. Ubi tribus nominibus lenitatem (sive ex hypothesi improborum sibi secure in vitiis indulgentium lentitudinem) Dei exprimit, qua abutuntur hypocritae, divini consilii ignoratione, iisque totidem nomina, severitatem Dei significantia, inverso ordine opponit. Est autem *χρηστότης*, ea facultas, qua se Deus commodum et (ut ita dicam) utibilem praebet usibus indignissimorum hominum, de male merentibus bene merendo: Cui opponit *ἡμέρα διακρισίας*, qua malos male multabit, et dignas sceleribus poenas rependet.

Ἀνοχὴ est tolerantia, et quasi conniventia, qua ad tempus dissimulat se videre, aut curare quid agant, aut admittant in se flagitii contumaces. Cui opponit *ἡμέραν ἀποκαλύψεως*, quando retecturus, et in publicum coram mundo prolaturus est *τὰ κρυπτὰ τῶν καρ-*

* [Sic in MS., sed ubi auctor tale verbum invenerit nulla conjectura augurari possum. Si verbum *perspicaces* vel *oculati* reponas, veram fortasse auctoris mentem consequeris.]

διῶν. Denique μακροθυμία, qua differt et prolatat iram, i.e. ultionem, ad tempus, sed non prorsus aufert, ut, quod vulgo dici solet, "quod differtur non aufertur," hic locum habeat. Cui opponit ἡμέραν ὀργῆς, diem ultionis, qua vindictam sumpturus est de praefractis et cervicosis. Hac occasione sententiam propositionis syllogismi proponit et explicat cap. ii. v. 2, et deinceps; eamque tam gentilibus ἀνόμοις, quam Judaeis ἐννόμοις applicat occupando, quae in contrarium obiici possent.

Τέλος.

COMMENTARIUS IN EPIST. PAULI AD ROMANOS.

CAP. I.

Epistola Pauli ad Romanos est totius Christianismi divina epitome; constat autem tribus partibus—προλόγῳ, i.e. praeloquio, λόγῳ et ἐπιλόγῳ, sive capite, corpore et calce, instar perfecti animalis, ut loquitur Plato de omni oratione perfecta. Prologus sive praescriptio ad 17 v. de sua vocatione, et studio erga Romanos quo ad scribendum incitatus fuit. De sua vocatione agit prima periodo, ubi notanda ellipsis verbi ad affectum exprimendum, quemadmodum et in salutatione. "Paulus Romanis"—sub. ἐπιστέλλει, seu γράφει. Subjectum hujus enuntiati multis argumentis amplificatur, et illustratur ab adjuncto munere, sive officio, in genere, quod servus Christi sive publicum gerens sub Christo rege et Domino ministerium; in specie, quod apostolus, ad quod munus legitime et efficaciter vocatus sit, per Antiochenum presbyterium, et a Deo ἀμέσως, ab utere, i.e. aeterno, Gal. 1. (κλητὸς autem non semper significat efficaciter vocatus, Math. xx. 16 πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσί κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δ' ἔκλεκτοι, contra receptam distinctionem) nec vocatus modo, sed etiam ἀφορισμένος, separatus, quippe autore Spiritu Sancto, Act. xiii. (ubi aperte distinguit Spiritus Sanctus inter ἀφορισμὸν, et κλῆσιν, et hanc illo priorem docet); sub. idque ad Evangelium praedicandum, quod est subjectum sive materia, in qua tractanda versatur apostolatus ut vocatio et separatio sunt in causis efficientibus apostolum. Evangelii vero causa efficiens assumitur Deus, qui est Evangelii et autor et Dominus, ut cujus ipsum est gratuita et ultronea promissio, jam inde a primo hominis lapsu in paradiso facta primum, ac deinceps repetita, ac subinde illustrata pro vario et multiplici gradu patefactionis, quod verbo ἐπηγγείλατο significatur. Evan-

gelium enim unum idemque re et substantia, ratione et tempore distinguitur, ut dici possit aut promissum, in quod patres ante Christum crediderant; et exhibitum cum Christo et per Christum. Unde natura Evangelium, quippe gratuita pollicitatio legalibus operum meritis opponi intelligitur. Antiquitatem indicat praepositio πρὸ, ne novitatis nomine elevetur ejus autoritas. Certitudo vero et indubitata veritas duplici testimonio, eoque divino, commendatur, quod se prophetae fuerint hujus divinae promissionis interpretes ac testes. Sanctae vero literae a Spiritu Sancto, amanuensibus prophetis, conscriptae, et ab ipso Spiritu Sancto dictatae, tabulae plane authenticae, ut de quarum autoritate nefas sit dubitare. Subjectum vero Evangelii adaequatum Filius Dei, persona una duabus constans naturis, humana, secundum quam filius Davidis, ac proinde Abrahami secundum promissionem et est et dicitur Math. i. Luc. iii. in genealogia Christi, ut Gen. xii. et xxii. et passim 2 Sam. vii. 1 Chronic. xvii., hoc est quod dicit factum, anno viz. mundi conditi 3927, (Spiritu Sancto Mariam virginem obumbrante) ex semine Davidis secundum carnem. Divina natura neque facta neque genita, sed per aeternam generationem a patre cum filio communicata jam inde ab omni aeternitate, et in plenitudine temporum mundo patefacta et manifestata; hoc enim est ὁρισθέντος anno 3960. Additur ἐν δυνάμει, sive ad manifestationem referas, sive ad Filium Dei, cujus potentia declarata fuit ad ipsius divinitatem declarandam resurrectione a mortuis, qua virtute sua, non aliena resurrexit a morte redivivus Jesus Christus, Dominus noster, quae tres appellationes includunt utramque naturam in una eademque persona, et officium mediatoris et servatoris prophetico, sacerdotali, et regio munere designant. Πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης vocat divinam naturam emphatice, et κατ' ἐξοχήν, cum electi Angeli, et piorum animae sint spiritus etiam sancti; Ideo non spiritum modo vocat, sed etiam sanctimoniae spiritum, i.e. autorem omnis sanctitatis, quae est in electis tam angelis quam hominibus, ut qui sit ipsa sanctitas. Sic Joan. iii. Christus Deum Spiritum esse dicit, et apostolus ad Hebr. ix., Christum ait per aeternum Spiritum, i.e. divinam naturam, obtulisse semet ipsum. Denique hic respondent γενομένου κατὰ

σάρκα, et ὁρισθέντος κατὰ πνεῦμα *i. e.* facto quoad humanam naturam, declarato quoad divinam. Unum igitur hic praecipuum divinitatis argumentum, resurrectio a mortuis, ἐξ ἀναστάσεως (sub. ἀπὸ νεκρῶν,) quae resurrectio specimen evidentissimum divinae potentiae et argumentum longe efficacissimum fuit, quo usus est Petrus et Paulus Act. ii. et xiii. Si resurrexit a mortuis, certe et morti traditus fuit propter peccata nostra, et excitato a morte ad justificationem nostri Rom. iv. ver. ultimo, quae duo summa sunt ac praecipua Evangelii capita, unde maxima ad nos duo beneficia redeunt, expiatio peccatorum et sanctificatio, haec a resurrectione, illa a morte dependens, ut postea dicetur. Atque ita Dei Filius verus homo, verusque Deus, Evangelii subjectum describitur, in quo Evangelio administrando versatur apostolus, cujus apostolatus autorem agnoscit Christum ita descriptum, Ephes. iv. 11, quem Apostolatum gratiam vocat, quasi gratuitum Dei donum, et beneficium gratis in se collatum. Objectum vero Apostolatus sui Gentes nominatim expressit, addita nota universali Omnes, ut alibi se doctorem gentium vocat; ergo etiam Romanorum. Finis autem et usus est obedientia fidei, quae est effectum Evangelii, q. d. ut quaevis gentes credant, et obediant Evangelio. Hic autem [illegible]atus est summa dignitas, ut quae sit legatio pro Christi [illegible]ne, ita enim conjungo ἀποστολὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, sic 2 Cor. v. pro Christo legatione fungimur, ubi et summus finis attingitur, nimirum gloria Dei in Christo ex gratuita salute electorum, quae sequitur obedientiam fidei; finis item subordinatus et minus principalis. Verbum ἐλάβομεν videtur opponi Pseudo-Apostolorum violentae irruptioni in ecclesiam, et usurpationi sine justa vocatione. Romanos fideles ex gentium numero esse, et ad suum Apostolatum pertinere docet, unde sequitur et se ex officii necessitate scribere ad Romanos, et illos ad audientiam et attentionem obstrictos esse, quae conclusio subticetur et quo spectat tota praescriptio. Atque haec de subjecto primi enuntiati multis argumentis illustrato ad Apostolicam autoritatem illustrandam. Attributum sequitur, Romanis fidelibus (sub. scribit,) quos describit a subjecto loco, et duobus adjunctis; locus hic est; omnibus qui estis Romae, quibus verbis non solum cives

Romanos, qui Romae agebant, sed etiam incolas omnes, et inquilinos modo fideles compellat: fidelium vero descriptio divino amore ab aeterno, et sancta vocatione in tempore comprehenditur, ut antea κλητοὺς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ efficaciter vocatos per Evangelium ad Christum fide amplectendum, et hic κλητοῖς ἁγίοις: nam ex ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ immenso illo Dei amore in Christo per Evangelium vocamur ad sanctitatem, quae est divinae gratiae in nobis effectum, et imputatae gratis obedientiae Christi in justitiam testimonium, nec minus electionis argumentum, quam aeternae vitae pignus.

Hactenus officium Pauli, et munus Apostolicum erga Romanorum Ecclesiam. Sequitur studium et benevolentia Apostolica: quae partim salutatione, partim gratulatione explicatur, ac primo salutatio Apostolica, i.e. religiosa et sancta. Gratiae et pacis nominibus fontem spiritualium benedictionum cum rivulis omnibus intelligit, ita ut gratia justificationis ex fide, et pax erga Deum, ut est initio v. cap., spem caelestem et caetera omnia spiritualia beneficia complectantur, quae a patre in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum in electos conferuntur. Unde ut patris, ita filii divinitas hac fausta precatione divinae largitionis argumento arguitur: quin etiam Apostoli erga Romanos studium et benevolentia tantorum bonorum imprecatione commendatur; nec minus sancta gratiarum actione, qua Romanis fidei celebritatem ex laetitia, quam capit ex eorum felicitate gratulatur;—Ubi non minus Christum filium cum Deo patre conjungit, ex aequo tanti boni autorem. Probat hanc suam propensionem animi et laetitiam ex felici eorum statu et fide, studio, quo incenditur provehendae et confirmandae illorum fidei, quippe desiderio illos invisendi hanc eandem ob causam; quod desiderium arguitur precum assiduitate, et perpetua Romanorum memoria sive mentione eorum, quam probat testimonio divino, Deum ipsum advocans in testem, idque sine omni fuco, ex animi sinceritate, qua Deo servit in Evangelii Christi praedicatione (ubi nota Evangelium ut Dei patris supra, ita filii ipsius Evangelium hic dici, quia de filio supra v. 3.,) q. d., precibus assiduis a Deo contendo ut me ad vos deducat (εὐοδωθήσομαι autem ad verbum, bene datus fuero in viam ex Dei voluntate)

impertiendi doni spiritualis, et vestri confirmandi causa; quod statim sancta prudentia ac modestia temperat, ac quasi corrigit subjiciendo mutuam sive consolationem, sive cohortationem percipiendam; ut se non minus paratum ad discendum et accipiendum innuat, quam ad tradendum et docendum. Denique occurrit objectioni:—Si hoc tuum est studium ac tantum desiderium nostri invisendi, cur tam diu distulisti adventum? Respondet se proposuisse quidem apud se saepius, sed impeditum fuisse atque adeo vetitum (ut innuit verbum ἐκωλύθην, causam impedimenti vide xv. 22.,) idque haud dubie divinitus, ubi finem rursus assumit pari modestia, ut fructum aliquem habeat:—ut fructuosum sit ejus ministerium Romanis, quod in accepti beneficii, ac emolumenti loco ducit.

Postremo se in aere quasi alieno, et debitorem Romanis esse, quod illustrat parium aut similium argumento, et a genere argumentatur, Omnibus cujuscunque gentis, aut ordinis, aut conditionis sum debitor, ergo et Romanis. Ut profuit aliis Apostolatus meus, ita velim et paratus sum ut prosit Romanis; quod probat affectione animi sui, et aestimatione Evangelii, cujus tantum abest ut cum pudeat, ut Deo glorietur maxime, ut is cujus labor in Evangelio non fuerit irritus in domino, ut nuper innuebat, et alibi totidem verbis scribit, vide infra xv., 17, 18, 19, 20. Est enim in his verbis "non me pudet," litotes sive μείωσις. Cur de Evangelio ita glorietur causam reddit descriptione quadam Evangelii a causa efficiente atque effecto, et adjuncta potentia Dei ipsius ad salutem quorumvis hominum conficiendam; q. d., Evangelium est organum, quo Deus exerit potentiam suam servandis electis, tam ex gentibus, quam ex Judaeis; quod et ipse in me expertus sum, et quotidie in aliis experior: Non est igitur, cur me pudeat Evangelii, ut ab ejus praedicatione desistam, sed est cur pergam alacriter in hoc cursu Evangelico; et Romanis cum id non permittatur coram viva voce, saltem absens scribendo suppleam. Atque ita ingreditur secundam Epistolae partem, quam λόγον et γραφὴν appellavimus, quae extenditur ad xv., 14. Cujus summa propositio sive conclusio haec est trimembris; Evangelium salutem affert fidem conferendo qui-

busvis servandis. Nam quod dicit, cuivis credenti, innuit Evangelium esse credendi seu fidei instrumentum, quaquam obscurius hic in prolepsi, tamen et sequente v. si dextre intelligatur, et in progressu, puta cap. x. apertissime demonstrat, ubi verbum fidei quod praedicamus appellat Evangelium. Hujus duae sunt partes; prior, doctrina de justificatione fidei ad salutem tam gentium quam Judaeorum usque ad cap. xii.; posterior, exhortatio ad sanctificationem quorumvis tam gentium, quam Judaeorum ad xv. 14. Quod Judaeos anteponat ordine gentibus, ideo est, quod oportuerit Judaeis, quorum praerogativae infra ix. 4, 5, habentur, primum annuntiari Evangelium, cujus promissionibus longe suavissimis allici oportuit ex oraculo Noachi Japhetum, ut habitet in tentoriis Semi, Gen. ix. Disputatur autem justificationis ex fide doctrina quatuor capitibus; 5to concluditur ex ea spes salutis certissima; et sanctificatio justificationis effectum ac certum testimonium, atque adeo aeterna salutis pignus 6to, 7to, et prima parte cap. 8vi. Ut et altera ejusdem capitis parte justificatorum et sanctificatorum, atque adeo per adoptionem filiorum Dei aeterna salus et gloria certissima magnificentissime concluditur, 9no, 10mo, 11mo capp. tam Gentibus, quam Judaeis communem hanc salutis et justificationis rationem, ex aeterno Dei decreto et praedestinatione deducit. Judaeorumque magna ex parte rejectionem ad tempus, Gentium vero quasi in locum eorum substitutionem tanto ante praedictam divinis oraculis confirmat. *Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ.*] Justitia Dei quae est fide retegitur per Evangelium ad fidem ingenerandam animis electorum. Ergo Evangelium conferendo fidem, et ex fide justitiam, confert salutem. Justitiam Dei *ἀντιθετικῶς* justitiae humanae, et naturae viribus praestandae oppositam intelligimus. Eandem justitiam ex fide vel fidei justitiam appellatam justitiae operum opponit quemadmodum aperte, cap. iii. v. 22, justitiam Dei per fidem Iesu Christi vocat, et c. ix. v. 30, justitiam quae est ex fide, et cap. x. v. 3, opponit Dei justitiam propriae Judaeorum justitiae, et justitiam quae est ex lege, v. 5, justitiae quae est ex fide, v. 6. Itaque hic est trajectio, et ellipsis articuli; sic ergo construe, *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἡ ἐκ πίστεως ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται εἰς πίστιν,*

ut eandem justitiam et Dei et fidei hic diversa ratione intelligas appelari; eamque Evangelio patefieri non irrito conatu, sed efficaciter ad fidem gignendam; hoc enim est εἰς πίστιν, ut supra εἰς σωτηρίαν ad salutem conferendam, atque ita significatur efficacia Evangelii sive potentia Dei per hoc suum instrumentum, quo fidem efficit in audientium animis ad fidei justitiam apprehendendam, quae eadem est Dei justitia, quam Deus largitur ex mera gratia; et ad capiendam et apprehendendam eam postquam oblata est, fidei quasi manum confert, sine qua Christus in justitiam apprehendi non potest. Quare et fidei, sive ex fide justitia dicitur. Nec debet haec trajectio violenta videri, cum crebro occurrant hujusmodi apud Apostolum exempla, et non grata modo auribus, sed etiam efficax ad significandum sit illa ex fide in fidem pa[ra]nomasia: cujusmodi compositione et vocum allusione ad sensum efficaci non nusquam utitur Apostolus, cujus causa non veretur saepenumero verba trajicere. Philip. c. i. v. 21.

Sequitur confimatio tam antecedentis, quam consequentis, (quippe justitiam fidei cum fide, et salutem dari per Evangelium) ex oraculo prophetae Abacuc, quod oraculum est Evangelicum, i.e. promissio justitiae fidei, et ex justitia fidei vitae aeterna per Evangelium conferenda. "Justus ex fide victurus est." Quae sententia apud prophetam illustratur ἀντιθέσει contrariae infidelitatis, et exitii ex infidelitate, quemadmodum eleganter ad Heb. x., sub finem explicatur, ubi τοῖς πίστεως opponit τοῖς ὑποστολῆς, v. 37, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς, gemina antithesi fidei et infidelitatis, salutis et exitii; ut nemini dubium esse debeat, quin δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως sit legendum loco subjecti viz. Justus ex fide, ut jusititia ex fide supra hoc eodem versu, et passim in hac disputatione dicitur. Itaque Apostolus optimus prophetae interpres et hic et ad Gal. iii. et ad Hebr. x., hoc dictum pro fundamento et summa Evangelii adhibet, quod scilicet pollicitus fuerit Deus prophetae excubias agenti, et deploranti statum ecclesiae miserandum, in modum deformatae cum suis sceleribus, tum hostium populationibus, Christi adventum in carnem, et cum Christo exhibito

Evangelii efficaciam ad justitiam atque salutem. Jussit enim oraculum hoc tanquam publicum programma describi, quasi grandioribus characteribus, ut quam facillime a quovis vel cursim praetereunte legatur, aut saltem ita plane describi, ut quivis illud vel cursim perlegat, vel legendo percurrat. Monet visionem rejectam esse in longinquum tempus, sed certo asseverat suo tempore eventuram, interea ad patienter expectandum hortatur. Ideo Apost. ad Hebr. verba non numeravit, sed sensum appendit, atque expressit, cap. x. v. 37. Ετι γὰρ μικρὸν, hic distinguendum, deinde ὅσον ὅσον, (quantum, quantum, i.e. quantumcunque longinquum fuerit tempus) ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ. Unde intelligas ita prophetam de visione loqui, ut Christi adventum cum Evangelii praedicatione, et per eam justitiae et salutis manifestatione praedicet. Haud scio an affixum ו apud prophetam verti debeat *ejus*, an *sua* fide, utrum ad justum ex fide, an ad Christum Dominum, (LXX. videntur ad Christum retulisse, ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται,) cujus adventus praedicitur, referri debeat. Certe non frustra Apostolus justitiam Dei ex fide scripsit, et postea cap. iii. et alibi justitiam Christi, et fidem Christi vocat. Certe nusquam neque hic, neque ad Gal. neque ad Hebr. affixum expressit. An ideo hoc factum ab Apostolo, ut ambiguitatem vitaret, nec ne? nihil affirmo; interim non cessat hoc verum esse in omnibus qui servantur, quod Christus uni dixit singulariter, Fides tua te servavit. Dictio vatis Abacuc duo, vel etiam tria in Christo beneficia pollicetur gratis per Evangelium conferenda, nimirum veram justitiam, veram fidem, et veram vitam. Justitiam veram, quippe Dei, et ex fide; justitiam Dei, quia donum Dei est gratuitum, et filii Dei, qui verus Deus est in humana natura ad mortem usque crucis, obedientia perfecta, ac proinde Deo omnibus modis grata atque accepta; Fidei vero justitia, quod non nisi instrumento fidei nostra fiat, et a nobis apprehendatur; atque hoc est beneficium justitiae Evangelicum. Alterum est, fidei ipsius naturae, et causarum ordine justitiam antegrediens, quod nobis per Evangelii auditionem impertit Deus, cujus fidei quasi manu Christum in justitiam nostram apprehendimus. Utraque igitur, tam

fides, quam justitia Dei ex fide est gratuitum Dei in Christo beneficium in nos collatum Evangelii praedicatione, quae duo beneficia hujus effati prophetici parte antecedente comprehenduntur, viz. δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως, justus ex fide. Unde alterum coniugatorum, justitia ex fide, quae fidei justitia, et justitiam, et fidem complectitur, coniuncta quidem, sed distincta beneficia, quorum fides se habet ut causa saltem instrumentalis, justitia vero ut effectum ratione communicatae nobis per fidem justitiae. Tertium beneficium ex his duobus consequitur, quippe vita, sive salus beata ac sempiterna in altera effati parte, ζήσεται. Justitia enim Dei affert vitam Dei i.e. divina justitia vitam divinam. Justitiam praebens instrumentum est fides: fidem praebens instrumentum est Evangelium, quae visionis nomine, et Christum in Evangelio exhibendum propheta significare videtur, hic est ergo ordo horum beneficiorum. Evangelium patefaciendo justitiam Dei ex fide, dat atque indit mentibus animisque nostris fidem, fides data confert justitiam Dei ex fide, divina ex fide justitia est vitae aeternae causa. Atque haud scio an haec sit Dan. ix. justitia saeculorum quae dicitur i.e. sempiterna, sive hominibus in mundo conferenda. Atque ita posito fundamento justitiae, et salutis per Evangelium in Christo adipiscendae, eoque divinitus prophetica praedictione stabilito, superstruit disputationem de justificatione, refutans primum omnium et hominum et operum justitiam. Est igitur prior disputatio ἀναστευαζική. Nullus injustus ex operibus aut justitia sua coram Deo justificabitur: Omnes homines sunt injusti: Nullus igitur homo ex operibus vel sua justitia coram Deo justificabitur. Est ἀπόδειξις negans Cesare.* Propositio habetur sub initium cap. ii. et tractatur ad 17 v. eiusdem. Assumptio partim hoc capite, et initio sequentis, et cap. iii. a 9 v. ad 20 in genere; partim a 18 v. cap. ii. ad 9 v. cap. iii. ex parte contra Judaeos pertractatur. Unde conclusio infertur cap. iii. v. 20. Cohaeret v. 18 cap. i. cum praecedente. Omnes homines sunt ex se et ex operibus legis sive naturalis sive Mosaicae injusti, et irae divinae obnoxii, quae est assumptio generalis syllogismi. Ergo Dei ex fide justitia

* [Vide Whateley's *Logic*, ch. iii. § 4.]

in Evangelio patefacta est ea, qua justificati servabimur, ut habet sententia prophetae Abacuc; non est igitur, cur se tam anxie crucient logici in his connectendis.

Hominum in se injustitiam tragice exprimit Apostolus dum eam vocat omnem impietatem et injustitiam hominum, q. d. omnes homines in se nihil aliud esse, quam omnem iniustitiam et impietatem, quam exaggerat ira Dei e coelo patefacta, quae magis magisque hanc hominum impietatem, et injustitiam divina vindicta accumulat et coacervat, dum peccata peccatis, et scelera novis sceleribus justo judicio justissimus judex ulciscitur. Atque hoc est quod dicit, iram Dei revelari in omnem impietatem et injustitiam hominum; ἀντιθετικῶς, vers. praecedente 17mo, justitia Dei ex fide in Evangelio revelatur in fidem. Videtur enim hic coelum Evangelio opponere, quia coeli enarrant gloriam Dei, Ps. xix., quod est naturae praeconium, et liber naturae vulgo dicitur, adeo ut Anaxagoras interrogatus εἰς τίνα γεγένηται; εἰς θεωρίαν (respondit) ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ οὐρανοῦ. Quasi dicat, naturae et contemplationis. Et philosophia tantum abest, ut justitiam conferat, ut contra, quantacunque notitia Dei per eam ex rerum contemplatione hausta hominem reddat ἀναπολόγητον, iramque Dei e coelo, unde cognoscitur, effusam in ipsos homines etiam philosophos arguat. Ideo statim postea τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ κόσμου eodem respiciens dixit. Utrumque probat, quippe et hominum injustitiam cum impietate conjunctam, et hujus impietatis injustae ex divina vindicta exuberantiam; ac primum ex veritatis divinae injusta detentione, hoc ipso p. 18, ut qui detineant Dei veritatem injuste. Sunt igitur et impii in Deum, et injusti in veritatem, ut qui eam quasi gestientem erumpere sanctis et honestis actionibus, captivam supprimunt et extinguunt. Hic duo spectanda, veritas illis cognita, et veritatis injusta detentio. De veritatis notitia 19 et 20 v. De eius injusta detentione tribus sequentibus ad 24. Veritatis nomine lumen naturale, sive theologiam, quam naturalem vocamus, intelligit, quam cum articulo την ἀλήθειαν vocat, non sine quadam emphasi, nam non est verisimile articulum ἀναφορικὸν esse, ut patefactionem referat Evangelicam, de qua supra v. 17. Verum

quia coeli mentionem fecit, unde omnis fere illa cognitio naturalis ducitur, veritatis nomine naturalem de Deo cognitionem intelligi par est; ideoque articulum praeposuisse videtur hoc sensu: A coelo, unde est veritatis de Deo ex operibus notitia, revelatur sive patefit ira Dei in hominum injustitiam, eamque in Deum impiam, in ipsos philosophos, ut qui Deum ex hac veritate naturali et philosophica cognitum non glorificant, etc. sed suppressa veritate, ex qua Deum norunt, malitiose in Deum ingrati, ac proinde impie injusti sunt. Coelum ergo et veritas de Deo ex coelo cognita, inque homine et homini manifestata, ad omnem ignorantiae praetextum tollendum ordine consequuntur apud Apostolum. Eandem vocat τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, et φανερὸν dicit esse ἐν ἀυτοῖς, quod de luce Evangelica dici non potest. Hujus naturalis lucis Deum autorem praedicat, et utitur verbo ἐφανέρωσε sic a conjugatis: Deus ipsis ἐφανέρωσε hanc notitiam sui, ergo τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ φανερὸν ἐν ἀυτοῖς. Quaeri solet, quomodo se Deus manifestavit hominibus, impressionibusne insitis naturaliter, et anticipatis notionibus, quas κοινὰς ἐννοιας et προλήψεις, Cicero praenotiones et inchoatas intelligentias vocat, an contemplatione rerum creatarum et naturalium observatione in mundi opificio. Responditur utroque modo quanquam prior modus notitiae naturaliter insitae hic obscurius indicetur, clarius ult. v. τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες. Et ii. cap. 14, 15 v., videtur vocare opus legis inscriptum in cordibus, cujus vi facimus quae sunt legis, etc. Verum sine eo nullus alteri cognitionis modo locus, quem v. 20, explicat. Principia enim nobis quaedam ingenita, et notiones omnibus aeque eaedem, quae ab omnibus aeque item probantur, quae sunt contemplationum omnium quasi principia, quorum vi sensus, ut loquuntur philosophi, cum intellectu conjungitur, et tanquam unum efficitur; in qua sententia omnes fere philosophi, praeter Aristotelem unum, in quo quam exiguus fuerit divinitatis sensus, passim ejus prodit impietas: cogitur tamen subinde, velit nolit, immortalis Dei vim et naturam confiteri. Quemadmodum et Galenus, alioqui impius, ex fabrica humani corporis de usu partium divinitus concionatur. Apostolus vero omnium clarissime invisibilia Dei (aeternam potentiam et divinitatem) jam

inde a mundo condito, vel mundi conditu, ex operibus intellecta pervideri affirmat: Ubi expende illud νοούμενα quod non modo vim intelligendi praesupponit, quam νοῦν vocant Graeci, sed et ipsam intelligentiam sive praeceptas notiones, sine quibus alia non intelligimus. Dubitari potest de significatione praepositionis ἀπὸ, ut et nominis κτίσεως, significetne creationem ipsam, i. e. actionem creandi (ut exposuimus) an res ipsas creatas sine temporis notatione: quod posterius non videtur propter illud, quod subjicitur de operibus, ποιήμασι; esset enim ταυτολογία, nisi ita distinguas: —Invisibilia Dei operibus intellecta pervidentur in mundi quasi speculo, et ex rebus creatis perspiciuntur. Sed minus placet. Interea docet, quousque lumen rationis et naturae progrediatur in Deo cognoscendo, viz. ad tollendum omnem ignorantiae praetextum, ut non habeant, quod pro se coram Dei tribunali in dicenda causa obtendant, hoc enim est esse ἀναπολόγητον, ab usu forensi translatione sumpta. Ceterum naturalem Theologiam ad duo capita revocat, ad notitiam aeternae potentiae, et notitiam divinitatis, quarum altera infinitam, immensam, simplicem Dei essentiam, altera proprietates ceteras essentiales complectitur. Illud εἰς τὸ εἶναι, si finem indicat, et usum notitiae naturalis de Deo, respicit, v. 19, superiorem, unde pendeat oportet, q.d., Deus reliquias naturalis lucis in homine lapso ad huc superesse voluit ad eum convincendum: sin vere proxima respicit, significatur eo tantam Dei notitiam, ac tam claram homini reliquam esse lucem, ut praecisa sit omnis excusandi sui aut tergiversandi causa: Ideo subdit, "propterea quod cum Deum cognoverint," quibus verbis ingreditur notitiae illius abusum, quem injustam veritatis detentionem vocavit, "non glorificarunt ut Deum," ideo impii; "aut grati fuerunt," ideo injusti, gratitudo enim justitiae species est, contra injustitiae species est ingrati animi vitium: Atqui impietas et injustitia sunt habitus voluntatis humanae quantum depravatae, praesertim erga Deum. Sequitur hallucinatio et caecitas intellectus, vanitatis, tenebrarum et vacuitatis intelligentiae verbis expressa, sponte, et ultro, atque adeo opera et industria nostra consulto accersita, ut sit ἄγνοια κακῆς διαθέσεως, ut cum ratione insaniamus, et ratiocinando, et curiosi-

tati ingeniorum indulgendo rationem omnem perdamus, cum a principiis natura notis ad cerebri nostri deliramenta ac figmenta delabimur: cujusmodi exempla videre est apud philosophos, et Platonem ipsum in Socraticis dialogismis: Verbis hic utitur valde signatis et significantibus. Confer cum iv. cap. 18, 17, versu ad Ephes. ubi habes *ματαιότητα τοῦ νὸος ἀυτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτισμένους τῃ διανόιᾳ διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τὴν οὖσαν ἐν ἀυτοῖς, διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας ἀυτῶν.* Ἀσύνετος quid sit et *σύνεσις* vide Camerar. in Ethic. Arist.

Atque haec voluntatis et intellectus corruptela et coecitas, imo insana amentia quoad internam idolatriam. Externa sequitur 22 et 23 v. quae est *μωροσοφία.* Sapientiam professi (ut Graeci primum *σοφοί,* sapientes, postea *φιλόσοφοι,* sapientiae studiosi a Pythagora sunt appellati, de quo Cic. *Tusc.* 5, puram, putam fatuitatem, et insulsam stoliditatem, impiamque stultitiam dictis, 22 v. factis 23 versu, aperte produnt. Emphaticum est *φάσκοντες,* sapientiae persuasionem et jactantiam ob oculos ponens; quin et tria verba, *ἐματαιώθησαν, ἐσκοτισθη, ἐμωράνθησαν* passiva cum incremento progressum habent, et reciprocam, ut opinor, ex Hebraismo, significationem: Ut significetur, ipsos se homines et dementasse et infatuasse, donec dementes, insipientes, et fatui prorsus evaserint. Idolum mens concipit, manus parit, ideo sequitur 23 v. "Mutarunt gloriam incorruptibilis Dei, etc." Observa antithesin, gloriam, similitudinem imaginis; corruptibilis, incorruptibilis; Dei creatoris, creaturae gradatim vilescentis, quippe hominis, volucrum, quadrupedum, serpentum. Vide quasi in pictura idolomaniam Gentium, et mysticam Aegyptiorum theologiam, omnigenumque Deum monstra, ut habet poeta. Atque hactenus veritatis captivae ex impietate et injustitia detentio ad impietatem et injustitiam hominum traducendam. Sequitur divina vindicta in impie injustos et injuste impios homines, cujusmodi natura sumus omnes; estque paena peccato analoga ex Dei justitia et quasi lege talionis: Nam homines in Deum contumeliosi atque injurii permittuntur sibi, ut se contumeliis atque injuriis mutuo inter se afficiant: imo Deus justissimus judex hominem suis cupiditatibus, foedis affectibus, et cor-

rupto judicio tanquam carnificibus tradidit, obtorto collo per omne flagitiorum et scelerum genus turpiter et crudeliter abripiendos, ut injustitiae et impietatis nullus sit vel pudor vel modus. Tres gradus vindictae sive ultionis divinae respondent superioribus tribus gradibus injustae in Deum impietatis, inverso ordine: Primus gradus poenae, 24 v., vagarum libidinum impuritas, qua sua ipsi corpora conspurcant homines, respondet ultimo gradui impietatis, et externae Idolomaniae, v. 22 et 23, quae repetitur tanquam causa horrendi judicii divini in idololatras, v. 25, ut qui mutarint veritatem Dei in mendacium, i.e. Deum verum in commentitium idolum, ut supra, v. 23. Mutarunt gloriam incorruptibilis Dei, i. e. gloriosum et incorruptibilem Deum, &c. Quod dicit, praeterito creatore semper praedicando et celebrando, laudibus creaturam venératos esse et coluisse, significat idololatras verum Deum nullo modo colere, ideo vocat, Ephes. ii. 12, ἀθέους ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. Deinde dum colunter imagines rerum creatarum ipsas creaturas divinis honoribus non sine summo sacrilegio affici; atque ita non colitur Deus, contra primam tabulam omnem, et colitur idolum itidem contra primum et secundum praeceptum, atque adeo tertium prioris tabulae. Secundus gradus divinae ultionis, quam ἀντιμισθίαν πλάνης vocat, portentosae et nefariae praeter naturam libidines, quibus se promiscue contaminant 26 et 27 v. Analoga secundo gradui impietatis in Deum, quem πλάνην vocat, quippe portentosis et monstrosis de Deo, cultuque divino opinionibus et erroribus, v. 21. Tertius gradus ultionis divinae illustratur similitudine peccati, v. 28. Quemadmodum non probarunt Deum habere in agnitione; quod idem est cum eo, quod 21 v. habetur; Non ut Deum glorificarunt, aut grati fuerunt, peccatum, ut dixi, voluntatis profanae et deploratae: Sic tradidit eos Deus εἰς νοῦν ἀδόκιμον, i.e. mentem reprobam, spuriam, adulteratam, instar falsae monetae, corrupto nimirum judicio, et sublato rerum delectu, nullo justi, injusti, sancti, profani, turpis, honesti habito discrimine, ut νόυς non mentis modo judicium, sed multo magis voluntatis προαίρεσιν et electionem indicet, quod etiam intelligi potest ex verbo ἐδοκίμασαν, non probarunt, id quod Latini dicunt, non visum est iis, non placuit, neque gratum neque

acceptum fuit, ut nullo modo propenderet in Dei agnitionem voluntas. Ideo tradidit quasi in manus corruptae voluntatis, et omnis sani judicii et bonae electionis expertis; unde manarent a malis vitiorum habitibus omnia scelerum et flagitiorum genera, quae vocat τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, generali nomine κατὰ μείωσιν, quasi dicas non consentanea officio, i. e. ab officio discrepantia et repugnantia maxime. Observa mali fontem νοῦν ἀδόκιμον, i. e. justo Dei judicio corruptam voluntatem, in voluntate vitiosos ad summum habitus, quos significat his verbis, πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, μεστοὺς; et nominibus habitum significantibus, ψιθυριστὰς, &c. Deinde pravas actiones ab ipsis habitibus exundantes, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα.

Egregia ac luculenta pictura hominis non regeniti, et concio legalis subjiciens oculis praeclarum scilicet liberi arbitri in natura humana post lapsum reliqui facultatem. Enumeratio 23 vitiorum nominibus constat, quorum quaedam generalia, ut ἀδικίᾳ, κακίᾳ, quaedam specialia magis, ut πονηρίᾳ contra sextum praeceptum, πορνείᾳ contra septimum decalogi, pleonexia contra octavum; φθόνος, φόνος, ἔρις, δόλος, κακοήθεια contra sextum; ψιθυρισταὶ, κατάλαλοι contra nonum; Θεοστύγεις contra primum prioris, si minus, totam prioris tabulam; ὑβρισταὶ, contumeliosi in Deum, et injuriosi in homines; ὑπερήφανοι, ἀλάζονες, superbia et jactantia Deo et hominibus invisi, infesti; ἐφευρεταὶ κακῶν, scelerum novorum inventores monstra hominum; γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, parentibus rebelles contra quintum mandatum. Sequuntur quinque composita nomina cum a privandi particula, ut et superius proximum, quae ita absentiam innuit et vacuitatem laudabilis qualitatis ac bonae affectionis, quam altera pars compositionis significat ut ne pilum quidem boni viri, aut guttam humanitatis reliquam esse demonstret; et crescit mirifice in immensum oratio, ut pestes humani generis depictas graphice ab Apostolo et subjectas oculis in oratione Paulina videas, quasi dicas, alienos ab omni sana intelligentia veri aut boni, alienos a pactis conventis, et foederum servandorum religione et fide; vacuos affectus naturalis in liberos aut parentes, qui omnium animalium communis est; implacabiles et irreconciliabiles, immisericordes et truculentos. Quibus 23 scelerum monstris adjicit v. ult. haec omnia

malitiose et contra conscientiam non patrari solum ab ipsis hominibus, sed etiam applausu et patrocinio, cum ab aliis patrantur, approbari, atque defendi, idque contra δικάιωμα θεοῦ, i. e. jus divinum plane agnitum, nimirum talium scelerum, talium facinorum, talium flagitiorum autores et populares aeternam mortem promereri; nullo tamen vel numinis, cujus vindictam non exhorrescunt, vel poenae, cujus gravitatem non reformidant, metu aut formidine maleficio submoventur, aut praecipitem in omne scelus impetum sistunt. Haec juris divini agnitio procul omni dubio principium habet ab ingeneratis a natura notitiis, quae ratione et sensu provehuntur, et cum aetate accrescunt in eam agnitionem justitiae divinae, et scelerum conscientia mentes hominum constrictae teneantur. Atque haec generalis est generis humani, in hac miseranda lapsus ruina, convictio, quod impiae in Deum, quem natura cognitum habent, injustitiae rei, voluntatis a Deo aversione, mentis circa Deum aberratione, dictorum et factorum contra Deum externa ἐιδωλομανίας deformitate seu absurditate accersunt sibi, et quasi extorquent a summo judice triplicem triplicis injustae in Deum impietatis ἀντιμισθίαν, qua seipse tanquam carnifices afficiunt et plectunt, sed ita quidem, ut paena culpae analoga culpam augeat, et impietatem et injustitiam hominum nova impietatis et injustitiae accessione cumulet in immensum, et cum scientes, prudentes ita peccent in Deum et in se homines, non possunt non esse inexcusabiles. Unde infert apostolus initio secundi capitis ex hoc antecedente, omnes homines sunt injusti. Ergo et tu hypocrita quisquis es, qui belle vitia tua dissimulas, et virtutem ac sanctimoniam prae te fers aliorum vitia acriter et acerbe insectando et objurgando, es inexcusabilis.

SECUNDUM CAPUT.

Hermogenes Rhetor negare ausus est apostrophas gravitati orationis figuras; sed apostolica autoritate Graeculo illi ne credatur Sunt alii palam flagitiosi, alii larva sanctitatis et innocentiae tam sibi quam aliis imponunt. Prius illud genus hominum tanquam satis superque convictum relinquit; alterum vero genus personatorum hominum, conversa ad eos per apostrophen oratione, persequitur, et ut vividius afficiat, et acrius pungat hypocritas, singulariter, quasi cum homine uno sibi negotium sit, aggreditur, et hominem vocans, cum qui seipsum fallit fiducia virtutis suae a genere ad speciem argumentatur hoc modo :—Homo es, ergo ἀναπολόγητος. Consequentia patet ex superiore disputatione. Item, Alium damnas hominem, ergo teipsum condemnas; argumentum a paribus, quia in eadem causa es, cum eorundem scelerum reus sis cum eo, quem damnas, ac proinde illum damnando teipsum condemnas et una eademque opera in teipsum juxta ac illum damnatoriam sententiam pronuncias. Verum quia negaret hypocrita cum Pharisaeo se publicani similem esse, quod lateret homines ejus improbitas, apostolus eum citat ad tribunal Dei, cujus judicium est secundum veritatem, quem in causa cognoscenda latere nihil potest, qui non externam speciem spectare solet, aut personam (quod dicit) in judicio excipere, sed intimos animorum sensus perscrutari, et secundum aequitatem, causam ipsam solummodo intuens, sententiam ferre. Atque hoc principium est naturalis theologiae, unde Apostolus argumentum ducit ad quosvis homines naturae luce coarguendos : ideo dicit οἴδαμεν, scimus et compertum habemus, tanquam publico omnium hominum testimonio, et universali consessu comprobatam sententiam, in medium adducens ; et certe multa hujus generis in hanc sententiam extant apud profanos autores, ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούει, ἔχει θεὸς ἔνδικον ὄμμα. Sic

igitur argumentatur; Deus est justus judex in injustos, sive in eos, qui talia agunt; atqui tu hypocrita injustus es, et talia agis; Ergo, Deus in te erit justus judex, et quod idem est, Dei judicium non effugies. Rursus hominem appellat et praefidentiam objicit, et interrogationem figurans orationem acrius pungit hypocritam ad larvam detrahendam; ideoque repetit a paribus argumentum, quo suo ipsius judicio ipsum condemnatum arguat. Deinde spem impunitatis anticipat collectam ex poenae dilatione, acsi sic ageret hypocrita: Cum Deus sit καρδιογνώστης ac norit omnia etiam occultissima, mihi, si eorundem scelerum reus essem, quae damno in aliis, mihi, inquam, tam diu non pepercisset. Hanc divinae lenitatis et tolerantiae exceptionem retorquet Apostolus, docetque alium in finem spectare, non ut spe impunitatis pergat amplius peccare, sed ut, facilitatis divinae suavitate ad resipiscentiam invitantis, vitam in melius commutet, et quod gravius est, tantae benignitatis contemptus reum peragit, imo vero ob duritiem cordis et obfirmatum in malo animum, certum et grave exitium interminatur meritissimo: quod verbo θησαυρίζεις signate expressit, ubi universo ordine ὀργὴν τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ, ἀποκάλυψιν τῇ ἀνοχῇ, et δικαιοκρισίαν τῇ χρηστότητι opponit, q. d. Deus, qui hactenus facilis et indulgens pater fuit, futurus est mature justus judex et inexorabilis; quod probat 6 v. generali sententia divinae justitiae consentanea, reddet cuique Deus secundum opera sua; ac statim distributione utitur per concessionem, quasi alii justi natura, alii injusti essent; atque ita justis salutem aeternam, injustis denuntiat exitium sempiternum, sive illi Judaei fuerint, sive Graeci, i. e. sublato personarum discrimine; ubi notanda propositionis generalis sententia hic comprehensa. Nullus injustus ex operibus coram Deo justificabitur, cum ratione, quia Deus est justus judex redditurus unicuique secundum opera sua, ita ut bonis bene, malis male sit futurum a Deo; sicque illustrat antithesi et contrario bonorum praemio exitium quod malis impendit. Pluribus describit tam bonos quam malos, et bonorum praemia, malorum supplicia, oratione etiam ad captum ethnicorum attemperata, ut in tota superiore disceptatione. Videtur autem malos appellare τοὺς ἐξ ἐριθείας, injuriosos in homines et

in Deum contumeliosos, contentiosos, quasi ex contentione conflatos, vel illarum partium et factionis, quae litem Deo intendit, et refractarie rebellis sibi justitiam propriae virtutis falso arrogat. Contra vero bonos, quorum neminem preter unum Christum invenias, vocat τοὺς καθ' ὑπομονὴν, i. e. patientes injuriarum, et constantes in bono. Insertum v. 7, illud ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, utrum cum praecedenti ὑπομονὴν, an cum subsequente cohaereat, h. e. cum subjecta persona; an attributo praemio; ad rem vero et sententiam non videtur multum interesse. Observanda e nota universi generis, e. g. ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν, ubi expressa habetur sententia (ut dixi) propo. syllo. generalis accommodata tam Judaeis quam gentibus, i. e. omnibus hominibus, et ex consequente intelligendum antecedens, ut ex ira et excandescentia condemnatio et supplicium, ex oppressione et angustia, non solum metaphorice extremum quodque exitium, sed etiam, metonymia effecti, ipsa condemnatio. Idem est ergo quoad sensum, oppressio et angustia incumbet in omnem animam hominis perpetrantis malum, atque nullus injustus ex operibus coram Deo justificabitur. Hanc sententiam generalem Judaeis et Gentibus applicatam illustrat antithesi, Judaeis pariter et Gentibus applicata. Cujus sententia est, bene et beate erit bonis omnibus sive Judaeis sive Gentibus, quam beatitudinem gloriae et honoris et pacis nominibus explanat, atque hoc idem est acsi diceret, omnis perfecte justus aut bonus coram Deo ex operibus justificabitur; justum vero atque injustum in hac disputatione describit ab effectis operum bonorum aut malorum. Subjicit v. 11, rationem a natura Dei summe justa, apud quem nulla est προσωπολημψία, 12 v. Occupat κατὰ πρόλημψιν quod a Gentibus et Judaeis objici potuit, gentes legis Mosaicae ignorationem, Judaei vero ejusdem cognitionem et quasi possessionem obtenderent. Quibus respondet, peccantes tam ex Judaeis quam ex Gentibus perituros, ac proinde condemnatum iri gentes quidem absque lege Mosis, Judaeos vero ex ipsa lege. Rationem affert condemnationis Judaeorum, v. 13, diversorum argumento: Non qui audiunt, sed qui praestant legem, apud Deum justificandi; condemnationis vero gentium duobus sequentibus 14, 15, causam reddit, quod licet

legem Mosaicam non habeant, tamen naturae legem habent, propter cujus transgressionem damnentur, et cujus vim ac sensum animis mentibusque impressum docent opera, quae vi naturae faciunt, jubendo et approbando quod bonum est, quo spectat etiam conscientiae testimonium. Denique rationum momenta, inter sé conflictu mutuo pugnantia, sive accusent, sive excusent. Sunt igitur hic tria argumenta legis naturalis in omnium hominum animis impressae altius, opus legis, quod est iubère bonum et vetare malum, testimonium conscientiae, et vis rationis excogitans in hanc aut illam partem argumenta ad accusandum aut defendendum. Illud autem 16 v. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ quando indicabit Deus, videtur pendere a verbis 12 et 13 v. ἀπολοῦνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιωθήσονται, et non cohaerere cum proxime praecedentibus in hac eadem periodo. Caeterum rursus urget Dei judicium cum notatione temporis, ut supra, v. 5, cum nihil sit tam occultum, quod eum latere possit, ad terrendos hypocritas et confessionem peccati extorquendam omnibus; quia transit a propositionis sententia, quam pluribus confirmavit, et relabitur ad assumptionem, praecipue in Judaeos stringendam et evincendam. Et hoc judicium a Christo judice exercendum, et exigendum ad normam Evangelii, quod suum vocat Apostolus, quod sibi fuit commune cum ceteris Apostolis omnibus, sacri ministerii ratione. Qui enim non crediderit in filium hominis, et, ut iii. Johan, dicitur, ὁ ἀπειθων τῷ υἱῷ, non videbit vitam, sed ira Dei manebit super ipsum. Vel potius Evangelii meminit, quod ex eo constet, Christum fore in glorioso adventu suo omnium judicem, ut etiam in Symbolo confitemur. Hactenus propositio summa v. 2, 8, 9, inclusa, reliquis disputata et confirmata, quippe, nullum injustum ex operibus ullius legis coram Deo justificatum iri; ab hac (ut dixi) redit ad assumptionem. Et quia Judaei superbi ac cervicosi legem et circumcisionem obtendebant, anticipat omnem praefidentem illorum gloriationem per concessionem omnium praerogativarum, et privilegiorum, quibus freti gloriabantur, a v. 17 ad 21, in quibus recensendis grandi ac pene fastuosa κατα μίμησιν oratione utitur. Respondet autem usque ad capitis finem, cujus responsionis summa est, Nihil aut legem, aut circumcisionem illis ad justitiam prodesse,

cum circumcisio obliget ad legem servandam, quam illi cum Dei et Judaismi ignominia transgrediuntur. Quod probat divino Scripturae veteris testimonio. In praerogativis prima est cognomentum Judaei, honorificum sane illud propter tribum Juda, et regnum in ea tribu, et Davidem, unde Messias oriundus: dicti prius Israelitae ab Israele, et Hebraei ab Hebero; sed tertium illud Judaei nomen et cetera omnia comprehendit, et divinae laudis professorem, et praedicatorem ostentat, et erat ea aetate commune omnibus Israelitis, et aliis Gentibus notissimum. 2da, Lex ipsa, cui suaviter et secure quasi indormientes in ea acquiescebant, sed nomine tenus. 3a, Deus, qui Abrahami Isaaci, Jacobi, atque adeo populi hujus Deum se nominat, et foedere pacto cum iis habitare quasi praesens aspectabili modo dignatus est. Notentur grandia et signata verba ἐπονομάζῃ, ἐπαναπάυῃ, καυχᾶσαι pro καυχᾷ. 4a, Divinae voluntatis notitia, quam oraculis et Prophetarum vocibus familiarius huic populo manifestavit. 5a, Videtur huic affinis exploratio et dijudicatio eorum, quae cum divina lege pugnant, nisi mavis διαφέροντα, praestabilia, eximia et selectissima quaeque ex mente Judaeorum significari: hanc quamcunque explorandi et probandi facultatem ex auditione legis viva voce traditae (hoc enim vult κατηχούμενος) collectam docet. Ex hac scientiae legalis persuasione sequuntur fastuosi tituli quatuor, quibus sibi magisterium superbe in alios, tanquam ignaros et caecos tenebriones, et imprudentes infantes vendicabant. Huc spectant nomina Pharisaei, νομικοὶ, νομοδιδάσκαλοι, γραμματεῖς, Rabbi, Rabbinu, Rabbotenu, vide Math. xxiii. ad quos ut legem edoctos et legis doctores, cujus tradendae methodum et viam compendiariant, superciliose venditabant, hi quatuor tituli, quorum duo metaphorici, et totidem propriis verbis expressi, peculiariter accommodantur; ideo dicit ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας: Unde videri potest certam tradendae legis, quasi praescriptam formulam tum in illorum synagogis frequentatam fuisse. Magna emphasis et efficacia in particulis ἰδὲ συ, et apostrophe; atque haec de praerogativis, et inflatis titulis, v. 21, refutatio: Qui igitur doces, etc. Vulgatum est, "turpe est doctori, etc." Interrogatio est hic cum admiratione.

Summa est: Qui pharisaice vetas in legem peccare, cum omnis peccati in speciem detestatione, quae vetas, facis vel eadem, vel graviora, cum nominis divini contumelia, quod probat Ezech. xxxvi. 23, ut videtur, obsignatis agens tabulis ad eos convincendos: Atque ita omnibus cum lege praerogativis transgressionem legis opponit; qua una etiam circumcisionis exceptionem repellit, quamquam circumcisum esse et Judaeum esse re unum sint: Ideo cum praeputio comparat, quo nomine et praeputiatum ex Gentibus intelligit, atque etiam Gentilismum. Dicitur autem ἀκροβυστία a tegendo summam naturae partem, quam Celsus glandem vocat; Latine vero praeputium contrario sensu, quod pellicula glandem tegens circumcisione praeputiaretur: hinc Judaeus Apella apud profanum poetam, et Recutitus, et alia ejusmodi probri loco a profanis objecta. Adverte Apostolum in tota hac comparatione ex hypothesi disputare, ne quis existimet cum Papanis aut Judaeum aut Gentilem ullum perfecte legem in hac vita praestare posse: Sed hoc vult Apostolus circumcisionem ad operum justitiam sine legis observatione nihil posse: ideo dicit 25 v. circumcisionem fieri praeputium, i.e. externum ejusmodi Judaismum violata lege pro Gentilismo habendum, nec alterum altero quicquam magis ad justificationem ex operibus coram Deo conferre. Sic 26 v. dum praeputio tribuit, i.e. gentili, et praeputiato custodiam legis vel institutorum legalium, nihil affirmat nisi ex conditione, si esset ullus hujusmodi, ejus Gentilismus ei pro Judaismo imputaretur, et Gentilis pro Judaeo merito haberetur. Consimilis conditio est v. 27, quod est ex natura praeputium, i.e. Gentilis naturaliter praeputiatus legem perficiens aut praestans, non quod praestet aut perficiat nisi in Christo fide apprehenso, ut omnes vere Christiani: sed nihil hoc ad justitiam operum, de qua hic disputat. Judaeum vocat τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς, i.e. litera et circumcisione praeditum aut fretum, et legis et circumcisionis externae fiducia peccantem contra legem. Quod ergo ait, Gentilem legis custodem damnaturum Judaeum legis transgressorem, ex hypothesi ait, nisi fidelem ex Gentibus et Christianum forte intelligas: ideoque 28 v. definit verum Judaeum, et veram circumcisionem non externa professionis nota,

sive lege et circumcisione, sed interna Spiritus efficacia, i.e. resipiscentia et fide, cui opponit γράμμα, i.e. literam legis sine Christo emortuam et occidentem, ut 2. Cor. iii. c. luculente exponit: sic carnem cordi opponit, ut literam Spiritui 29 v.—[οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος] cujus Judaei, qui dignus hoc nomine, laus non ex hominibus, qui externa tantum spectant, sed ex Deo, qui interiorem cordis conversionem intuetur, atque acceptam habet.

TERTIUM CAPUT.

Occupatio orta ex occasione superioris responsi et capitis fine:—Si nihil externus Judaismus et externa circumcisio prodest ad justitiam operum, Judaeus Gentili quid interest? aut quo mihi circumcisio? Cum hic articulum [proponitur] tam Judaeo, quam circumcisioni, quaeri potest, moveaturne quaestio de vero Judaeo et vero circumcisione, cujusmodi modo definivit? an universe et in genere vel definite loquatur? ac nititur haec objectio pluribus Scripturae locis ut Exod. xviii.; Deut. iv.; Psal. cxlvii. τὸ πεϱισσὸν significat amplius quid, quam habeat Gentilis, quo tanquam dignitatis et excellentiae praerogativa gaudeat. Subjicit responsionem, πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τϱόπον, multam magnamque modis omnibus esse excellentiam veri (ut videtur) Judaei, et verae circumcisionis, cujusmodi fuit Abrahami, aliorumque fidelium Judaeorum. Ratio est, quia primarium et quasi palmarium hoc est in divinis beneficiis in veros Judaeos collatis, quod eloquia Dei, h. e. oracula divina de foedere non solum operum, sed etiam gratiae apud eos deposita fuerint, et illorum fidei concredita: ex quibus non solum praecepta legis, sed etiam promissiones de Christo Evangelicas percipere potuerunt; λόγια hic est quarti casus post verbum ἐπιστεύθησαν, ut alibi διάκονίαν πεπιστευμαι. Sed 1 Tim. iii. 16. dicitur de Christo, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ; ac forte et hic significatur Patriarchas divinis de Christo promissionibus fidem habuisse et credidisse: nisi quis malit utramque significationem hujus verbi hic intelligere, ut sit sensus; Ju-

dacis concredita fuisse divina oracula quibus credidérunt. Atque haec est Judaei praerogativa ex parte Dei, et gratia, non ex operibus aut natura. Altera occupatio :—Quid si Judaei aliqui fuerint perfidi, deserto foedere, vel infideles, ut qui fidem promissionibus gratiae non habuerint: Respondet, illorum perfidia Dei fidem, et constantem in servandis promissis veritatem labefactari non posse; imo licet omnes homines (ut reapte sunt natura sua) sint mendaces et perfidi, tamen illibatam mansuram esse Dei fidem ac veritatem, quod Davidis exemplo et divino testimonio ex Ps. li. confirmat, "Ut justificeris, etc." Quibus verbis veritatem et justitiam Dei, Davidis perfidia et injustitia in negotio Bersabe, et Uriae caede non modo labefactatam non fuisse sed etiam summopere illustratam, ut cum David contra fidem datam multiplici, eoque gravissimo scelere se obtrinxisset, Deus ex foedere gratiae in Christo et resipiscentiam Davidi, et veniam peccatorum omnium indulsit, et promissa sua omnia cumulate praestitit. In comminationibus etiam judiciorum, et comminationum executionibus non minus item fidelem se, quam justum exhibuit, sive Deus hunc finem ob oculos habuit, cum Davidem labi permitteret ad veritatem et justitiam declarandam : sive David in agnitione et confessione sceleris sui huc respexit, ad gloriam Deo ex sua ignominia praebendam. Hinc nascitur una et item altera objectio de justitia et veritate Dei ; Davidis injustitia et mendacio illustrata, quam utramque quaestionem inverso ordine proponit, ac primum de justitia dei judiciorum, quod fuit posterius in verbis Davidis : Num Deus injustus, qui puniat eum, cujus injustitia illustratur justitia Dei. Respondet temperando objectionem, quod ex aliorum hominum profanorum, non ex suo sensu sit deprompta, et amoliendo blasphemiam tanquam absurdam ; eamque refutat ab officio et effecto Dei futuro in ultimo mundi totius judicio, q. d. Deus mundum, cujus injustitia justitia suae gloriam illustrabit, est juste judicaturus, et, ad gloriam justitiae suae illustrandam, sempiternis suppliciis mactaturus. Altera objectio de veritate, v. 7, Si veritas Dei hominum mendacio ad gloriam Dei amplificata illucescit, cur homines mendaces et perfidi damnentur ut peccatores : quam objectionem auget majori absurditate, cur non

faciamus mala, ut bona eveniant. Hanc objectionem blasphemiam et calumniam vocat, qua se suamque doctrinam adversarii gratiae gravare soliti sunt, ideo tantum absurditatem et falsitatem non alio dignatur responso, quam justi judicii, et meriti exitii in autores denuntiatione, 8 v. καὶ μὴ (sub. faciemus mala, ut bona eveniant,) sicut male de nobis dicitur, et sicut aiunt nos dicere, faciamus mala, ut bona eveniant. Est igitur ellipsis sine ulla parenthesi legenda. Notandum in Davidis verbis justitiam sermonibus divinis, victoriam judiciis tribui. Justitia verborum veritatem Dei, victoria judiciorum justitiam (ut interpretatur Apost.) intelligi, et sic in Hebraeo purus Deus in judicando dicitur, Ps. li. 9. Quinta occupatio hujus capitis orta ex responsione primae objectionis. Nos ne ergo Judaei gentibus praecellimus? Respondet, nullo modo, quam enim excellentiam tribuerat, v. 2, fuit ex parte Dei in Christo, ex foedere gratiae communis omnibus Christianis, quamquam supra communem aliarum gentium sortem data lege, et circumcisione, aliisque collatis beneficiis quam plurimis universum Judaicum populum extulerat olim Deus: nunc vero negat ullum natura discrimen esse, quoad causam justificationis operum, inter Judaeos et gentes, quod superiore demonstratione a se demonstratum et confectum docet. Utitur verbo forensi προῃτιασάμεθα, i. e. ante criminati sumus, vel potius accusando et criminando reos peregimus et convicimus 1. et 2 cap. Quam convictionem Judaeis et gentibus communem Judaeorum causa potissimum divinis testimoniis obsignat. Ubi rursus habes picturam hominis non regeniti, longe luculentissimam, penicillo Spirito Sancto in sacris tabulis descriptam, et depictam vivis coloribus. Adimit universis et singulis hominibus primo justitiam omnem, deinde sanam intelligentiam, tum studium omne pietatis aut Dei quaerendi: mox omnium defectionem docet, adeo ut facti inutiles boni faciant nihil, ne unus quidem; atque haec v. 10, 11, et 12, ex Ps. xiv. et liii. Ubi Deum ut omnium rerum e coelo speculatorem et cognitorem inducit Propheta non testificantem modo, sed etiam judicium ferentem de genere humano, quod universum arguit ἀποστασιάς, v. 13, 14, 15, ex Ps. v. 10, et cxl. 4, et x. 7; Esaiae, lix. 7. Organa vocis fere omnia numero qua-

tuor, guttur, linguam, labia, et os cordis venenum et diritatem plus quam Cyclopicam effundere, et pedes ad sanguinem fundendum, et obvia quaeque conterenda, instar grandinis aut belluarum immanium properare testatur, denique viam pacis ignorare, i. e. expertes omnis humanitatis, et truculentia prorsus efferatos ritu ferarum esse; atque haec quoad secundam tabulam, et officia erga homines ad colendam societatem: fons autem vitiorum omnium 18 v. aperitur, quippe metus numinis divini vacuitas, et impietas contra tabulam primam. Conferatur ergo cum hac ex Dei verbo, et illa altera naturalis, cap. 1, humanae corruptelae descriptio, et opponatur omnibus omnium sophistarum nugamentis 19 v. subjungit ultimo loco valentissimum ad Judaeos convincendos argumentum a fine et usu traditae legis Mosaicae, quemadmodum supra, 1 cap. v. 20, a fine lucis et legis naturalis argumentatus contra omnes gentes, et hunc usum legis, tanquam notum omnibus et communi sensu comprobatum esse, verbo *οἴδαμεν* affirmat, nisi malis hoc restringere ad Apostolum, et alios vere Christianos. Scimus (inquit) quaecunque lex, *ὁ νόμος*, viz. Mosis dicit (*λαλεῖ*), i.e. familiariter et sedulo exponit, atque explanat eadem omnia, atque applicat omnium conscientiis, ad omnes et singulos violatae legis in omnibus et singulis mandatis reos peragendos: notanda enim distinctio inter *λέγει* et *λαλεῖ*, et *ἔλλειψις* correlativa ad *ὅσα*. Tit. ii. 1, *σὺ δὲ λάλει ἃ πρέπει τῇ ὑγιαινούσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ*, et v. 15, *ταῦτα λάλει*. Item 1 Pet. iv. 11. (*Εἴτις λαλεῖ ὡς λόγια θεοῦ*), edicit, jubet, vetat, imperat iis qui in lege vel sub lege sunt loqui, ut omne os obturetur, i. e. ut non solum gentes jam convictae lege naturae, sed etiam Judaei lege Mosis ac proinde omnes homines sint *ἀναπολόγητοι*, ut ne verbum quidem ullum ad sui defensionem queant proferre, atque ita mundus universus fiat obnoxius divinae condemnationi. Hinc infert 20 v. ex operibus ullius legis sive naturalis sive Mosaicae mortalium neminem coram Deo justificari: rationem subjicit, quia per legem est peccati agnitio, nihil enim tam pugnat cum justitia quam injustitia; per legem omnem arguitur et agnoscitur injustitia, Ergo per legem nullam, et, quod idem est, Ex operibus nullius legis coram Deo quisquam

justificetur, nam arguere peccatum ac injustitiam, et justificare vel justum pronuntiare sunt dissentanea atque opposita. Omnem carnem vocat omnes homines in Adamo natura corruptos, ac proinde irae filios, ut *υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας*, Ephes. ii. 2. *Νόμον* hic sine articulo posuit, ut tam naturae quam Mosis legem a justificatione excluderet. In hujus autem vocis unius varia repetitione est divina *ἀφελότης* et simplex (ut ita loquar) mundities non ad suavitatem modo, sed multo magis efficaciam. *Ὁ νόμος, τοῦ νόμου, ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἔργων νόμου, διὰ νόμου, χωρὶς νόμου*, ter cum articulo Mosis legem indicat, totidem vocibus sine articulo universe accipitur. Justificandi verbum forense hic est, ut cetera fere omnia in hac disputatione, et condemnationi opponitur, ut apud Solomonem et passim. Haec particula *διότι* ex usu Graecae linguae et hujus Apostoli causalis est, sic passim Aristoteles maxime in Problematis, sic Apostolus supra cap. i. 19 et 21, et ad Gal. iii. Sic Graeci omnes et Latini, sic Syrus interpres et Vulg. et Erasmus, sic Complut. et Philip. Biblia distinguunt puncto in summa linea. Quid multa? res ipsa hoc vult, argumento a genere ad speciem, sive a lege in genere ad legem Mosis. Nullus homo ex ullius legis operibus justificatur coram Deo; Ergo nec Judaei ex lege Mosaica, aut, ut loquitur Apostolus, Quaecunque lex Mosaica jubet aut vetat, eadem Judaeis instillat, ut eis convictis violatae legis omnes homines convincantur, et subjiciantur divinae condemnationi; atque hoc est, quod Apostolus effectum voluit jam inde a 18 v. 1 cap. Omnes homines esse *ἀναπολογήτους* et *ὑποδίκους τῷ θεῷ*. Fefelli fortasse interpretis nescio quae opinio prolepseos v. 19, cum sit novum argumentum, idque valentissimum a fine legis, quo et alibi utitur Apostolus. Est *ἀπόδειξις* Apostolica, cujus propositio subticetur, assumptio conclusionem sequitur, assumptionem vero ejusdem probatio. Expende diligentius. Syrus habet inscriptionem ante v. 19, Lectio Martyrum.* Unde intelligas v. 19 a 18 disjungi, et sensu distingui, et sectione nova novam inchoari sententiam. Hactenus ergo ostendit jam inde a 18. v. 1 cap. nullam in hominibus ullius gentis, aut ordinis justitiam per naturam esse, cujus merito

* [ܩܪܝܐ ܕܣܗܕܐ]

coram coelesti judice absolvantur. Quid superest ergo, nisi ut genus hominum funditus pereat universum? bona verba, Quin potius exclusa ex naturae viribus operum justitia ad Dei justitiam ex fide in Evangelio patefactam confugiamus. V. 21, Νυνὶ δὲ. Nunc autem, inquit Apostolus, absque lege, justitia Dei patefacta est, quippe per Evangelium, v. 17, cap. 1. haec igitur justitia neque legalis est, quia absque lege, neque humana, quia Dei justitia est, et nunc primum in Christo palam exhibita: verum μαρτυρουμένη, i. e., contestata, Legis et Prophetarum testimoniis tanto ante comprobata, ut de Evangelio, v. 2. cap. 1. praefatus est. Nec Dei solum est haec justitia, sed etiam fidei: ideo subjungit, v. 22, Justitia autem Dei per fidem, ut 1. cap. 17 v., Justitia Dei ex fide. Mox additur, Jesu Christi, ut fidei objectum proprium assignetur non tam Deus aut Dei verbum in genere, quam Deus et promissiones Dei in Christo pro objecto fidei intelligamus, ad quem Jesum Christum nobis in salutem omnium communicandum cetera omnia referuntur. Sic postea hoc eodem capite fidem Jesu vocabit fidem justificantem: quam vero late pateat haec justitia Evangelica, docent verba "In omnes et super omnes sine ullo personarum aut Gentium discrimine," addita tamen fidei conditione: hoc enim est quod vult participio τοὺς πιστεύοντας, praesenti tempore constantiam fidei, et in fide ad extremum usque perseverantiam innuens: Cujus fidei etiam in electis gignendae Evangelium est efficax instrumentum, ut dictum est supra. Rationem subdit, cur haec Dei et fidei justitia sit Judaeorum et Gentium communis, quod nimirum ambo aeque peccatores per naturam aeque sint miseri; Omnes enim homines aberrarunt injustitiae viam ingressi, et defecti viribus per naturam a tergo relinquuntur, nec ad metam divinae, gloriae queunt pertingere: nec mirum, cum verae virtutis et sapientiae viam, quae sola ad beatitudinem ducit, vix ac ne vix quidem ingressi in avia et praecipitia caeco impetu ferantur: Duo igitur interveniunt impedimenta naturae caecitate et corruptione, omnibus hominibus communia, Aberratio a recta via, et virium defectus et imbecillitas, ne metam coelestis vitae et gloriae contingamus. Cum haec impedimenta omnibus a natura pariter objici-

antur, sequitur omnibus justificandis supra naturam assurgendum esse, et Judaeis non minus quam Gentibus divina in Christo per Evangelium conferenda justitia necessario opus esse, cujus justitiae justificantis causas omnes accurate et luculenter tribus versibus, 24, 25, 26, explicat. Δικαιούμενοι, ut qui justificemur, v. 3, omnes, i.e. a peccatis absolvamur, δωρεὰν, dono quo nos Pater donat in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum, τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι sua ipsius mera gratia, ut neque sit in nobis a natura vel recipiendi facultas, vel promerendi virtus, cum causa (siquidem causae nomen hic rite adhibere fas sit) tam efficiens quam impellens et procurans extra supraque nos sit, nostramque naturam, quin et Christus est nostrum illud ἀντίλυτρον, cujus satisfactione tanquam pretio pro nobis exoluto in libertatem vindicamur; ad gratiam ergo Dei Patris accedit Christi obedientia ad mortem usque crucis de paternae voluntatis aeterno decreto: Nam Deus Pater, v. 25, ante mundum conditum proposuit secum (hoc enim est προέθετο) filium suum Jesum Christum ἱλαστήριον, i.e. placamentum, legali propitiatorio patribus adumbratum sub lege, idque per fundendum sanguinem suum, legalium victimarum umbratili sanguine adumbratum et praefiguratum; nobis vero et Patribus sub lege fidelibus per fidem Spiritus Sancti virtute apprehendendum. Finis autem consilii divini ab aeterno, et Christi populo veteri legalibus umbris olim praefigurati, fuit justitiae divinae in Christi adventu his temporibus ostensio, non secus ac siquis digitum ad eam intendat, hoc enim est εἰς ἔνδειξιν. Sed quaerat merito aliquis, quorsum opus demonstratione justitiae Dei; Respondet Apostolus, propter praeteritionem (hoc enim est πάρεσις) id est quasi conniventiam et dissimulationem ante commissorum peccatorum jam inde a lapsu primi hominis, quae expiata, ante Christum in carne exhibitum, ullo piaculari sacrificio non fuerant, idque ex tolerantia Dei, cujus justitiae pro Electorum peccatis satisfactum ante non fuerat. Ad demonstrationem inquam (sic enim urget finem divini decreti et adumbrationis tanti mysterii sub lege) divinae justitiae in praesenti tempore, quae justitia prius semper latere occulta videbatur, quam per aeternum Christus Spiritum seipsum obtulit, aeternum redemptionem adeptus, Heb. ix. Hujus.

autem declaratur justitiae finis, ut non solum constet, et liquido appareat omnibus Deum esse justum, ut qui, in morte filii acerbissima et ignominiosissima, summo jure, ultus sit omnem et Patrum omnium, et nostrum, et posterorum servandorum injustitiam, sed etiam gratis in Christo propter ejus meritum justificet omnes, qui fide obedientiam Christi in justitiam apprehendunt. Itaque justitia salutaris, qua nos coram Deo justificamur, non est humana, sed divina, non legalis, sed Evangelica, nec amplius umbris legalibus obtecta, sed cum Deo in carne patefacto et ipsa patefacta, et in bono Evangelii lumine collocata, nec nunc primum nata aut cognita, sed jam olim a lege et Prophetis praefigurata et praenuntiata, atque adeo etiamnum habens divinum et indubitatum a lege et prophetis testimonium, ut habet, v. 21. Nec Dei solum justitia est, sed etiam per fidem Christi justitia est, ideoque et fidei et Christi justitia et est et dicitur. Denique est omnium fidelium communis δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως, hoc est, quod ait Apostolus: In omnes et super omnes credentes, quia ad omnes pertingit, et ea induti vestiuntur omnes, ne eorum pudenda appareat nuditas: Sic enim distinguo, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας. An εἰς πάντας de imputata, ἐπὶ πάντας de inhaerente dicitur? Expende, ut altera expiati reconcilientur Deo, altera induti atque ornati conformes reddantur Deo. Communitatis ratio duplex, eaque communis omnibus aberratio et infirmitas, translatione a ludis Circensibus illustrata: hinc enim sumptae voces ἁμαρτάνειν et ὑστερεῖσθαι, quod posterius est defectu virium et defatigatione a tergo in cursu relinqui, et ad metam non pervenire, nedum ad praemium et coronam, v. 23. Est igitur justitia Dei ex fide Christi communis Judaeis et Gentibus, cujus causae omnes in Deo Patre et Filio et Spiritus Sanctus quaerendae et inveniendae, ut docet, v. 24 et 25, enucleate exponit. Δικαιούμενοι sub. ἐσμὲν vel εἰσὶ, Ellipsis verbi substantivi, ut qui justificentur. Δωρεὰν, dono fidei per Spiritum Sanctum ingeneratae, qua justitiam hanc dono item collatam apprehendimus. Τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι, ipsius Dei Patris gratia, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, et Christum et Spiritum et fidem in Christo per Spiritum nobis impertiens; Nostra autem justitia est redemptio per Christum

pa.ta, has tres causas explanat, Gratiam Patris aeterno ejus proposito, quo praedestinavit pacificatorem, et propitiatorem; Meritum Christi, qui propositus ab aeterno de sententia Patris, et sub lege umbratili propitiatorio hircorum piaculari sanguine asperso praefiguratus, et ipse tandem in plenitudine temporum verum placamentum suo ipsius sanguine irroratum exhibitus: hunc Christum, ἱλαστήριον καὶ ἱλασμὸν nostrum, recipimus per fidem efficaci operatione Spiritus Sanctus, atque ita conjungo ἱλαστήριον cum ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, et ita docetur Christum et justitiam Evangelicam a lege testimonium habere. Sequitur quarta causa communis Patri, Filio et Spiritui Sancto, tametsi Deo Patri peculiariter tribui videatur: finis enim est divinae justitiae celebratio seu illustratio, quae finis ob majorem efficacitatem et evidentiam semel atque iterum posita est, et quia declaratae justitiae Dei causam interposuit, necessario repetenda fuit. Causa autem ostendendae hujus justitiae fuit ejus sub veteri Testamento quasi obscuratio, non aliter ac si Deus dissimulasset suam justitiam ex indulgentia erga electos, cum nondum illi pro ipsorum peccatis reapse factum esset satis. Huc spectat praepositio διὰ cum quarto casu, et nomen πάρεσις, quae nunquam significat gratuitam condonationem et veniam peccatorum, sed ἄφεσις apud Apostolum et alios Graece loquutos. Tertio, causa τῆς παρέσεως non est pura puta misericordia hoc loco, quae sola est causa remissionis peccatorum, sed ἀνοχὴ θεοῦ, tolerantia Dei, quae poenam et ultionem non prorsus tollit, sed differt ad tempus. Denique προγεγονότα ἁμαρτήματα, ante Christum exhibitum commissa peccata, conferuntur cum praesenti tempore, quo, Christo pro peccatis mortuo, declaratur justitia Dei, quam ego interpretor, severitatem, qua ne filio quidem suo pepercit, sed in mortem tradidit illum, ut suae justitiae satisfieret. Unde emergit justitia, qua nos justificamur, et divinae veritatis et fidei secundum gratiosam in Christo promissionem praestatio et complementum. Ideoque finem repetit atque explicat, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον, ubi εἶναι est idem quod φανερωθῆναι, alioqui Deus ab aeterno justus, et hoc sensu Deum esse et justum esse est idem. Καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ] Cum summa justitia conjungitur hic summa

misericordia qua Deus justificat gratis ex mera gratia eum qui est ex fide Iesu, i.e. qui in Christum credit, alioqui per naturam impius ut cap. iv., "Qui justificat impium." Fides Iesu dicitur non qua credit, aut quam habet Christus, sed qua creditur et quae habetur Christo, v. 27. Sic descripta et explicata justitia fidei Evangelica ex omnibus ejus causis (quarum nulla extra Deum, sed in Deo omnes, et a Deo repetendae) infert novum argumentum pro stabilienda fidei justitia contra justitiam operum. Nulla homini superest in se aut suis virtutibus, aut viribus gloriandi materia, acsi ita dissereret: Ea justitia justificamur, quae nulla homini gloriandi materiam relinquit, omnem Deo tribuit gloriandi. At fidei justitia nullam relinquit homini, omnem Deo tribuit gloriandi materiam; contra vero se habet operum justitia: Unde concludit seq. ver., Fide, non operibus justificamur. Syllogismi assumptio hoc versu dialogismo tractatur, et figuratur interrogatione, qua velut insultat Pharisaicae operariorum praefidentiae. *Ubi igitur gloriatio*, i. e. homini in se suisque operibus gloriandi materia, cum de justificatione agitur. Respondet, *Exclusa est*, i. e. nulla homini reliqua est, cum non ab homine, sed a Deo sint ejus causae omnes. Per quam legem quaerit, an naturae, an Mosis, quae justitiam operum exigunt, quam nemo mortalium est solvendo: subjicit, non, i. e. neque per naturalis, neque per Mosaicae legis justificationem adimatur homini omnis gloriandi in se materia, nec omnis gloria Deo tribuitur, sed per legem fidei, i. e. justificationem fidei vel justitiam Dei ex fide, per Evangelium patefactam et collatam, omnis Deo, nulla homini tribuitur gloria. Si homo vel in solidum, vel ex parte, i. e. vel solis operibus, vel partim fide, partim operibus justificaretur, vera gloria detraheretur Deo, falsa homini affingeretur. Hic legis nomen mirifice et modificate, sed divinitus et significanter fidei tribuitur. λογιζόμεθα οὖν, 28 v.] Conclusio generalis et bimembris totius disputationis a 18, v. i. cap. Ergo fide justificamur, operibus autem nullis, et quod idem est, sola fide justificamur: Nam excludendi particula in hac enuntiatione tantum opera excludit, quod disertis verbis facit Apostolus χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου absque operibus legis ullius, sive naturalis sive Mosaicae, aut moralis, aut

judicialis, aut ceremonialis; absentia enim articuli significat nomen hic usurpari in genere, ut contra articulo addito restringitur ad legem Mosis, et supra et infra exempla extant complura. Vetus interpres vertit *arbitramur*, verbo forensi a plerisque male intellecto ut arbiter, et arbitrium boni viri apud Jureconsultos: unde errandi occasionem non oblatam temere arripuerunt Pontificii, qui dubitanter, non asseveranter Apostolum hic loqui voluerunt. At arbitrari non est semper dubitare, ut neque verbum putare, cum de putandis rationibus agitur; unde sumpta est similitudo, quae exprimitur verbo λογιζόμεθα apud Apostolum ab Arithmeticis et ratiocinatoribus, qui rationes seu ratiocinia ineunt et subducunt, sumpta translatione. Unde manavit verbi usus logicus a logistico nimirum, frequens apud philosophos, ut λογίζεσθαι ratione uti, ratiocinari, syllogismum seu ratiocinationem concludere, ut hoc loco. Significat igitur Apostolus se, quasi initis et subductis omnibus superiore disputatione rationibus, concludere duplicem syllogismum demonstrativum, alterum affirmantem pro fidei justitia, alterum negantem contra operum justitiam. Subjectum est ἄνθρωπος speciem humanam significans: homines universos et singulos in se complectens, qui coram Deo justificantur. Justificandi autem verbum hic, ut supra, et in tota hac disputatione, condemnationi opponitur, quod clarum evadit Rom. viii. 33, 34, θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; Fidei nomen verbo justificandi junctum, non hic consideratur absolute, tanquam infusa solum qualitas, ut interpretantur Sophistae, sed relatione ad Christum, cujus apprehendendi idoneum est instrumentum. Ideo non est ipsa per se fides seorsim in se considerata, cujus dignitate et merito justificamur, sed Christus, Christique perfecta ad mortem usque crucis obedientia, quam fides justificans apprehendit. Quare metonymica est locutio, cum fide justificari dicimur, aut fides justitia nostra. Atque haec de conclusione generali hujus syllogismi, Nullus injustus ex operibus coram Deo justificabitur. Omnes homines sunt injusti, &c. V. 29 ad communionem hujus justificationis explicandam regreditur, dialogismo usus, ut supra 27 v. cum doceret laudem hujus justitiae omnem Deo acceptam prorsus deberi, ut cujus sit in solidum autor

et causa omnis, unde et Dei justitia est toties appellata. Fidei justitiam esse, 28 v. conclusit; nunc, quod tertium est, communem Judaeis et Gentibus eam demonstrat; illos *περιτομὴν*, has *ἀκροβυστίαν* metonymice more suo appellans, v. 29. Prior ratio est a subjecto sumpta cum mutua affectione. Deus est tam Gentium, quam Judaeorum Deus, ergo fidei justificatio communis est Gentibus et Judaeis. Altera ratio, 30 v., sumpta ab unitate Dei, cujus una simplicissimaque essentia, voluntas, atque justitia, quae (ut dixi) in Deo unum sunt cum ipso Deo, non patitur alio Judaeos, alio Gentes modo justificari: Verum ut unus est Spiritus Sanctus unus Dominus, unus Deus, ita est una fides, quae unum Christum Dominum nobis applicat in justitiam: hoc enim sibi vult articulus in altero membro additus de Gentibus, qui priori membro de Judaeis appositus non fuit: vim enim habet *ἀναφορικὴν*, qua significatur hac, illa eademque fide, qua Judaei, etiam Gentes justificari: Ubi nota *ἐκ πίστεως* et *διὰ πίστεως*, et *πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι* prorsus idem esse, quibus locutionibus significatur, fidem esse divinam illam manum, quae justitiam nostram prehendens nobis eam confert. Stabilita Dei, quae et fidei, et communis promiscue, justitia, occurrit objectioni obortae ex generali conclusione, et nomine legis saepius repetitae, et a justitia exclusae. Si justificamur fide sine legis operibus, videtur fides quasi enervare legem, ejusque vim inefficacem et otiosam reddere: hoc enim est *καταργεῖν* atque ita legem prorsus antiquare. Hanc objectionem tollit aversando eam tanquam absurdam et blasphemam, contrariumque fidei effectum substituendo, legem, viz. stabiliri, i.e. Christo doctrinam hanc apostolicam de evangelica fidei justitia doctrinam legis et vim promovere magis et illustrare, ut postea est dictum.

QUARTUM CAPUT.

Altera objectio, quam praevertendo fidei justitiam omnibus servandis communem Abrahami exemplo confirmat. Sic ergo disserit, quomodo justificatus Abraham fuit, eodem omnes servandi justifi-

cabuntur: At Abraham fide justificatus fuit: Ergo servandi, sive electi, omnes fide justificabuntur. Propositionis sententia tribus ultimis versibus comprehenditur; Assumptio octo primis; Conclusio reliquis. Τί οὖν, assumptionis sententia contrario illustratur; Abraham ex operibus justificatus non fuit. Interrogatio enim negat hoc loco: Abrahamum vero patrem vocat non tam naturae respectu, quam gratiae. Secundum carnem idem est, quod meritis operum, q. d. Ne Abraham quidem, quanquam Spiritualis omnium filiorum Dei Pater, et verae justificationis exemplar, operibus justitiae laudem est consecutus. Ratio per distinctionem redditur, v. 2. Aliud est coram Deo, aliud coram hominibus justitiae laudem mereri: hoc Abraham fortasse potuit, illud nullatenus. Coram Deo nihil potuisse vel sanctissima opera Abrahami, probat divino testimonio, v. 3, atque ita ingreditur confirmationem justitiae fidei, quam antea legali propitiatorio confirmavit, propheticis testimoniis comprobare. Abrahami fides ad justitiam imputata fuit, xv. Genes. quod illustrat antithesi contrariorum, iv. 5. Ubi observa mercedem aliam gratuitam, aliam debitam: hanc rependi operibus, illam ex gratia donari, ut quae impio et nihil boni promerito gratis tribuatur, quo spectat propheticum Davidis oraculum, justitiam absque operum meritis beatitudinis nomine praedicans, 6, 7, 8, v., eamque in peccatorum remissione collocans, unde petenda vera justificationis sententia. Atque haec paucis de assumptione; Conclusio disputatur pluribus per dialogismum a 9 v. ad 23, communem sc. justificandi rationem justificandis omnibus tam Gentibus quam Judaeis, ad quam conclusionem illustrandam urgetur hoc idem Abrahami exemplum cum temporis notatione, et duplici statu: altero quidem in praeputio, quum nondum esset circumcisus, fide tamen justificatus: altero cum circumcideretur, et justitiae fidei tanquam sigillo obsignaretur. Abraham igitur ut incircumcisus Gentium, ut circumcisus Judaeorum exemplar fuisse tradit, sed neque circumcisionis, neque praeputii ratione, sed solius fidei justificatione, quod probat Abrahami item exemplo, qui non lege aut operibus est hanc dignitatem adeptus, ut esset Ecclesiae ex Judaeis et Gentibus colligendae Pater, sed gratuita fidei justitia. Ratio quod operum justitia non

Abrahamo patri solum, sed etiam filiis ex Judaeis et Gentibus haereditatem confirmet. Τὸ κληρόνομον εἶναι haeredem, i.e. dominum jure paternitatis spiritualis; haeredis enim nomine Dominus intelligebatur, ait Festus. Ps. cxxvii. 3., Heb. i. 2., Rom. viii. v. 17. Fides Abrahami supra naturam assurgens ex promissione divina accurate describitur, cujus vi promissionem amplexus reliquit exemplum posteris, fidem illis in justitiam imputatum iri: quae enim de Abrahamo in hanc sententiam scripta extant, filiorum, i.e. eorum omnium, qui in posterum crediturі essent, gratia literis prodita sunt. Denique Abrahami exemplum vim habet a jure paternitatis ad jus filiationis, quod non alia ratione ac modo acquirant liberi, quam pater; ideoque, 1. v., Abrahamum patrem nostrum vocat, i.e. omnium electorum tam ex Gentibus, quam ex Judaeis. Ideo haeredem mundi, et patrem multarum Gentium eodem sensu nominat, quam dignitatem non ex operum sed fidei justitia est adeptus, quod promissioni fidem haberet, cujus signum et sigillum non solum fuit nota circumcisionis, sed etiam litera cum uxoris, tum suo nomini adjecta, quod nomen interpretatur Deus, Abraham, i.e. patrem multarum gentium: estque paternitas ea ex promissione spiritualis, qua non solum Judaei, sed etiam Gentes per fidem in Christum conseantur in Abrahami semine, adeo ut Abrahami filium, et filium Dei hoc sensu pro eodem dici aestimetur. Caeterum fidem imputari in justitiam, justitiam imputari sine operibus, et peccatum non imputari, pro eodem accipi videatur. Unde justificatio de qua agit, tota in remissione peccatorum posita esse videatur, nec video quid addi possit ad plenam absolutionem a peccatis, quam justificationem appellavimus, quae tota pendet a morte Christi, sine cujus sanguinis effusione nulla remissio, Heb. ix. Et vero non solum quae omissionis et commissionis peccata dicuntur, quae vulgo actualia peccata appellantur, sed etiam labes illa haereditaria, cujus reliquiae haerent in sanctis, quae et ipsae in peccati rationem veniant, nec alia ratione quam unico mortis Christi sacrificio purgantur, et, ne in rationem coram Deo veniant, expiantur: Neque enim conceptus Christi, et nostrae in Christo naturae sanctificatio expiat sordes in natura nostra reliquas, neque per omnem vitam

obedientia Christi perfecta, qua plene legem praestitit, defectum legalis obedientiae supplevit in nobis; verum uterque hic indignitatis nostrae morbus non alio remedio, quam Christi morte curatur, non secus atque cetera peccata omnia, quae admittimus et patramus. Sed quaerat aliquis, quo nobis illa Christi in carne exinanitio, nostraeque naturae in ipso conceptu sanctificatio, ut cui usui tantus tamque perfectus amor Dei, et proximi, atque adeo in factis, dictis cogitatis plena legalis obedientia, nisi et illa sanctificatio, et haec plena legis praestatio nobis imputetur tum ad tegendam naturae nostrae impuritatem, tum ad supplendum legalis obedientiae defectum in nobis. Respondeo cum Apostolo decuisse nostrum pontificem ὅσιον, ἄκακον, ἀμίαντον εἶναι, non secus atque oportuit pacificatorem nostrum esse verum Deum, verumque hominem: haec igitur erant necessaria ad personam idoneam constituendam, quae sacerdotium susciperet, et suscepto fungeretur, et victimam idoneam, quae pro peccatis electorum Deo Patri offerretur; et quemadmodum Deum ab aeterno, et hominem κατὰ καιρὸν perfectae aetatis, καὶ τέλειον, ita sanctum etiam et justum ante esse oportuit, quam sacrificium offerret, aut sacerdotio fungeretur. Quare quae ad personae ἱκανότητα pertinebant, ea non debent inutilia censeri, cum fuerint apprime necessaria, neque tamen confundi cum actionibus sacerdotalibus, cujusmodi est oblatio sacrificii expiatorii pro peccatis omnibus. In summa sanctificatio, et activa (ut loquuntur) in vita obedientia ad qualificandam (ut ita loquar) Mediatoris personam requirebantur, ut non solum Christus sacerdos idoneus, sed etiam idonea victima esset, cujus per aeternum Spiritum oblatione sanctificaret in perpetuum credentes, et perficeret qui sanctificantur. Et cui condonata sunt peccata omnia, condonatae quoque illi naturae sordes reliquae, et carentia* omnis, atque defectus legalis obedientiae: quoniam tam hic defectus, quam illae sordes, non secus atque alia peccata Christi sanguine abluuntur; et cui haec omnia condonantur, cur non habeatur pro sancto et justo, ut cui non imputetur sua vel impuritas, vel injustitia: habetur enim eo loco, quo haberetur si sanctus legem praestitisset. Superest igitur sola mors Christi

* [Sic in MS.; sed novo et nulla auctoritate munito verbo usus est auctor.]

veri Dei, verique hominis perfecte sancti, et perfecte justi, cujus merito purgamur a peccatis nostris, et hac gratuita peccatorum remissione coram Deo justificamur, i. e. plene absolvimur, acsi nunquam peccassemus. Verum accedit aliud beneficium cum hoc priore conjunctum tempore, sed ratione disjungendum, nimirum sanctificatio, quae pendet a Christi resurrectione et vita rediviva, qua fit, ut nos quoque in novam vitam resurgamus, de qua posterius, Rom. x. "Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore fit confessio ad salutem:" oris confessio pro sanctificatione. Atque haec sunt duo illa beneficia, quae percipiunt credentes in eum, qui excitavit Iesum Dominum nostrum a mortuis, qui traditus fuit proper peccata nostra, et excitatus est propter justificationem nostram. Fortassis justificationis nomine Apostolum eo loco sanctificationem intelligit, quamvis alii efficaciam, qua applicatur meritum mortis Christi nobis ad expianda peccata, et nos justificandos, i. e. a peccato absolvendos, vel (ut alii volunt) ad imputandam nobis legalem Christi, et activam in vita justitiam, quae tamen mortem antecessit, qua morte opus non fuisset, si praecedens vitae obedientia ad justitiam imputaretur, neque resurrectionis beneficium dici possit, qua Christus redivivus non amplius moritur, sed vivit Deo. Excutiantur verba singula operosae illius descriptionis fidei Abrahamicae, cujus objectum non solum ex promissione Dei misericordia, sed etiam potentia, quam ut impotentiae naturae, sic omnibus impedimentis opposuit, adeo ut contra spem, ubi nulla esset humanitus, aut per naturam sperandi materia, sub spe tamen crederet; adeo ut neque corporis effoeti, et uxoris, et sui contemplatione fides ipsius aut infirmaretur, aut spes infringeretur sed e contrario, (ut pluribus explicat Apostolus a quo dicitur πληροφορηθείς, plene persuasus certa fiducia), cursum fidei teneret, non secus ac secundo vento plenis velis impulsa navis ferri solet. Quod sequitur ὁ ἐπήγγελται, vertunt omnes, *qui promisit;* videtur vertendum potius, *quod promissum fuerat.* Est enim verbum passivum, neque articulus masculini generis praepositivus cum verbo jungeretur, et scribendum fuisset ὅς ἐπηγγείλατο, 21, v. Observa hoc quarto capite undecies verbum λογίζεται pro imputata justitia, contra Sophistas, eam non minus impie, quam impudenter negantes,

QUINTUM CAPUT.

Infert cap. v. ex justificatione fidei beneficium pacis cum Deo (contra vero. cap. i., v. 18, *ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ*) quam multi interpretatur tranquillitatem conscientiae, nos vero reconciliationem, hujus tranquillitatis causam, cum Apostolo qui v. 9, 10, 11, reconciliationem cum justificatione conjungit. Vide Ephes. ii. *ποιῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ ἀποκαταλλάξῃ*, &c., *ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν*, et *εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην, ὅτι δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πάτερα*. Unde manat triplex illa fidei gloriatio sub spe gloriae Dei, v. 2, in afflictionibus, v. 3, in Deo per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, per quem nunc reconciliationem adepti sumus, v. 11. Unde enim illa gloriatio nisi ab efficacia Spiritus Christi persuadentis nobis amorem Dei in Christo, qui morte et sanguine Filii nos, cum peccatores essemus, justificatos; et cum hostes essemus, reconciliatos, est in vita servaturus per vitam Filii sui; atque hoc quid aliud est, quam certa salus, quae justitiam fidei consequitur. Tantundem ergo dicit hoc cap. acsi diceret, justificati fide certo servabimur, sive salutem aeternam consequemur, quemadmodum dixerat cap. i. Evangelium esse potentiam Dei ad salutem, quia per illud justitia Dei ex fide retegeretur in fidem. Ut igitur hactenus veram justitiam pervestigavit, ita hoc cap. certitudinem salutis aeternae ex ea justitia derivat, atque demonstrat. Justificationem hanc vocat abductionem per fidem in gratiam; qua adducti fuimus (Deo trahente, cum antea aversi essemus) per fidem in gratiam, in qua nunc stamus. Pacem vero cum Deo, sive reconciliationem nostram, gratiam illam, in qua nunc stamus. Standi verbo significat perseverantiae donum, quod cum justificationis et reconciliationis beneficio indissolubili vinculo cohaeret, unde spes certa nascitur salutis, et vitae aeternae. Non tam igitur justitiam fidei hoc cap. explicat ab effectis, quam ex justitia fidei deducit reconciliationem cum Deo, perseverantiae donum, spem salutis, consolationem in adversis, et certitudinem aeternae

vitae et gloriae, quae sunt effecta Spiritus Sancti in Christo, ex gratia Dei Patris, justificationem fidei naturae ordine consequentia. Spes autem gloriae divinae et vitae aeternae corroboratur in nobis afflictionibus, vi Spiritus Sancti qui datus est nobis a Patre in Christo, effundens illum Dei paternum amorem in corda nostra, ut sub cruce exerciti, paternam ferulam ex paterno affectu in bonum nostrum profectam agnoscamus, quos adoptione filios non tam punit ut judex, quam castigat ut pater. Observetur hoc Christianum paradoxon, oppressio effiat patientiam, patientia experientiam, i.e. exploratam et compertam reddit Dei praesentiam, et benevolentiam in nobis opitulandis, et sustentandis, ne ullis rerum adversarum casibus succumbamus, quae experientia spem divini auxilii, et liberationis, et vitae in nobis confirmat; nec sperata nos frustra habet, quia Deus nunc amore nos in Christo prosequitur, quo nos, cum adhuc nullis viribus et impii essemus, amplectebatur; ut qui filium pro nobis in mortem et peccatoribus, et hostibus tradiderit; unde colligit, quanto magis nunc justificatos, et reconciliatos servaturus sit per vitam ejus. Quod vero ait, vix pro justo quemquam emoriturum, fortasse pro bono (ubi nota artic. τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ qui abest a voce δικαίου) aliquis emori ausit, id ad amplificandum Dei in nos amorem positum est, qui neque justi neque boni fueramus, cum Christus pro nobis vitam effunderet; haud scio an τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ nomine significet ἀγαθοποιοῦντα, beneficum, et bene meritum de nobis, an idem fere quod δίκαιος, propter articulum fortassis hoc in loco ἀναφορικόν. Certe videtur δίκαιον ἁμαρτωλοῖς, et ἀγαθον ἐχθροῖς opponere, sic ut crescat oratio, et amoris divini in Christo amplitudo, qui non solum pro nobis peccatoribus, qui neque boni, neque justi eramus, verum et peccatores et hostes, filium in mortem exposuit, cum vix pro justo quis emoriatur, tametsi forte pro amico, et bene merito de se aliquis mori sustineat. Notandum quod, v. 9, ex justificatione deducat conservationem ab ira, i. e. liberationem ab ultione divina propter peccatum, et ex reconciliatione conservationem in vita, ex sensu divini amoris erga nos, cujus autor atque effector est Spiritus Sanctus in nobis, v. 11. Tertia gloriatio, gradatim enim et per gradus tres procedit orta ex

fide gloriandi fiducia, prima fuit sub spe gloriae Dei, v. 2.; 2a, in adversis v. 3.; 3a, v. 11, in Deo per Dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, nam alibi dicit, absit mihi gloriari, nisi in cruce Domini nostri, etc., et qui gloriatur, in Domino glorietur. Sed et spem salutis et solatium in adversis a Deo esse in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum agnoscit Apostolus, et utriusque causam hujus tertiae gloriationis materiam esse. Materia ergo hujus gloriationis est reconciliationis, unde pendet salus, beneficium a justificatione pendens. Ideo dicit, per quem reconciliationem adepti sumus, v. 12. Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ.] Quamobrem sicut ingressum est peccatum in mundum, et per peccatum mors; ita etiam mors subingressa pervasit omnes homines. Ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, ab eum, ob quem omnes peccarunt. Est enim ἐφ' ᾧ ambiguum, generis vel masculini de Adamo, vel neutri causam indicans. Videtur autem haec non mutila, sed plena similitudo, qua alte repetit argumentum fiduciae et gloriationis nostrae a Dei voluntate, etiam tum, cum primum permitteret hominem labi in peccatum et mortem, q. d. propterea, ut esset nobis amplа gloriandi in Deo per Christum materia, non solum peccavit Adam, et ob peccatum morti obnoxius fuit, verum etiam mortem cum peccato transfudit in omnes ejus posteros; atque ita ὥσπερ et οὕτως inter se respondent, ut notae similitudinis protasin et apodosin inter se conjungentes, καὶ vero particula non redundat, sed auget sensum, ut Latine sic etiam. Duo igitur sunt, peccatum et mors, quibus duo attribuuntur, nimirum ingressus et privatio, Graece melius εἰσῆλθη, καὶ διῆλθη, sicut peccatum et mors ingressa sunt humanum genus per primum hominem, sic pervaserunt omnes homines, ut jam inde a lapsu fuerint peccatores et mortales, et mortales quia peccatores, et peccatores propterea quod in primo homine peccarint, vel saltem propter primi hominis peccatum cum ipso et rei sint, et peccato infecti, ut non possint amplius non peccare; peccasse autem probat, quod peccatum in mundo fuerit usque ad legem Mosis, quod probat ab effecto peccati, quippe morte ipsa, quae grassata est in omnes homines usque ad Mosem et deinceps. Ergo peccatum fuisse oportuit, cujus causa omnes homines mortem subierunt promeriti; verum sine lege pec-

catum esse non potuit (ἁμαρτία enim est ἀνομία) multo minus potuit imputari, h. e. ἐλλογεῖται. Oportuit ergo ante legem Mosis aliquam legem fuisse, cujus violatio mortem accersiverit, et cum non solum adulti, sed etiam infantes, qui per aetatem Adami more novi peccaverint, cum nondum haberent ullum rationis usum; sequitur illos in Adamo peccasse, aut saltem propter Adami peccatum peccati et mortis reos fuisse, hoc est illud, quod vulgo originale peccatum dicitur, cujus partes duae. Una quidem interdicti in esu vetiti pomi violatio, quod primum fuit primi hominis peccatum, cujus nos omnes in ipso rei sumus; pars altera, corruptio naturalis et peccandi proclivitas, quae cum Adamo omnes posteros peccato mancipavit. Ab Adamo igitur injustitia et mors facta est humano generi gentilitio jure haereditaria, adeo ut per naturam non possit non peccare. Verum hic primus Adam posterioris Adami typus fuit, quem promissum statim sub primi hominis lapsum usque ad legem Patriarchae, ac post legem pii omnes sollicite expectarunt; ideo hic ὁ μέλλων dicitur, i. e. qui venturus erat, et cujus adventus differri longius videbatur; adsignificat enim vox haec moram, et cunctationem; in evangelica historia ὁ ἐρχόμενος dicitur ut Mat. xi. σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, et alibi, fortasse etiam apud Joan. i. hoc sensu dicitur, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Sic apud Dan. cap. ix. v. 26, נגיד הבא princeps venturus dicitur. Si Adam Christi typus fuit, et injustitia et mors culpa Adami propagata in omnes homines typi fuerunt justitiae et vitae per Christum cum electis communicandae. Quare ut injustitia et mors per Adamum ingressa et progressa in omnes homines electos, ut 18, et 19, fusius explicatur similitudo. Igitur si Adam Christi typus fuit, certe in peccato et morte per Adamum invecta in genus humanum evexit Deus initio cum peccaret Adam salutare signum justitiae et vitae, per Christum participandae; atque hoc est, quod dixerat supra xii. 5, διὸ τοῦτο; respicit enim gloriationem in Deo per Christum propter reconciliationem, cujus meminit proxime superiore, v. 11. Illud διὸ τοῦτο neglectum ab interpretibus diligenter expendendum censeo; neque enim otiosum est, licet absit a quibusdam exemplaribus. Fuerit ergo typicus Adam quasi sublatum contra mortem

et inferos sub ipsa principia tropaeum, ut judicat nomen τύπος, tantum mysterium cum similitudine quasi ad unum verbum contrahens. Sequitur similitudinis illustratio a dissimilitudine imparium, tribus vers. 15, 16, 17, ac deinceps similitudine duobus vers. plenius explicatur, 18, 19. Ad dissimilitudinem intelligendam opus est quarundam vocum animadversione, ut χάρισμα, cui opponitur παράπτωμα.

Adam.	Christus.
Παρακοή.	Ὑπακοή.
Παράπτωμα.	Χάρισμα.
Ἁμαρτία.	Δικαιοσύνη et χάρις διά δικαιοσύνην.
Κρῖμα, judicium, i. e. reatus quia judicium occupatur in reatu adjudicando sonti.	Δώρημα.
Κατάκριμα.	Δικάιωμα.
Κατάκρισις θανάτου.	Δικάιωσις ζωῆς.
Θάνατος.	Ζωή.

Πηγὴ καὶ ῥίζα, fons et radix mortis et vitae est Adami παρακοή, unde ejus τὸ παράπτωμα, unde ejus ἡ ἁμαρτία, unde est τὸ κρῖμα, quod secum affert κατάκριμα, et hoc κατάκρισιν θανάτου, unde mors aeterna sequitur. E regione respondet Christi ἡ ὑπακοή, τὸ χάρισμα, ἡ δικαιοσύνη, τὸ δώρημα, τὸ δικάιωμα, quae omnia quinque pro eodem sumi (quamquam diversa ratione) videntur; atque una et eadem Christi obedientia vocari etiam ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν τῇ χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡ περισσεία τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς καὶ τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Praeterea τῷ παραπτώματι non solum τὸ χάρισμα, v. 15. sed etiam τὸ δικάιωμα opponit Apostolus v. 18, et τῷ κρίματι non solum τὸ δώρημα, sed etiam τὸ χάρισμα opponit. Ex quibus intelligi potest, unam Christi justitiam, quae et obedientia dicitur usque ad mortem crucis ad Phil. ii., istis omnibus appellationibus diversa ratione insigniri; ut sciamus exundantem Dei gratiam, et exuberantem gratuitae in Christo justitiae vim, nobis a Patre

gratis imputatam, et efficacia Spiritus nobis dati per fidem communicatam, nos non solum ab omni reatu liberos, sed etiam justos constituere coram Deo, cum dicatur etiam δικάιωμα, quod κατακρίματι proprie opponitur; quamvis 18 v. ei δικαιωσιν ζωῆς opponat, quod ideo factum, ut intelligamus efficaciorem Christi obedientiam nobis servandis, ac proinde justificandis, ac justis constituendis, quam Adami inobedientia sit nobis perdendis, ac proinde injustis constituendis. Observa tam justos quam injustos constitui multos, non tam sua, quae ipsis inhaereat, quam quae Adami et Christi sit hujus obedientia, illius inobedientia, et cum περισσεία τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης Christi obedientia dicatur v. 17, inchoatae in hac vita sanctitati nostrae convenire nullo modo potest. Λαμβάνοντες, (v.17,) i. e. prehendentes fidei manu ex gratia Dei virtute Spiritus justitiam Christi, etc. Quod non videtur proprie dici posse de sanctorum operibus sanctis, atque haud scio an de ipsa in nobis inchoata sanctitate, quae suis paulatim gradibus procedit in hac vita: observa participium praesentis temporis, ad continuationem sanctificationis indicandam; non enim dicit λαβόντες, sed λαμβάνοντες. An quia tardis incrementis progreditur nostra sanctificatio, quae individuo nexu cum justificatione cohaeret, et utrumque beneficium opponat, non tam reatui solum, sed et corruptioni ab Adamo in nos derivata; quae duo materiam mortis subministrant, dum nos non κρίματι solum, sed etiam κατακρίματι et κατακρίσει τοῦ θανάτου atque adeo τῷ θανάτῳ obnoxios reddunt. Num e contra justificationi conjuncta sanctificatio tandem perfecte complenda ad vitam faciat necne dispiciendum. Certe justificationis et electionis testimonium, atque adeo vitae aeternae pignus certum in hac vita esse constat; perfecta vero in glorificatis futura, videtur δικαίωμα νόμου atque adeo πλήρωμα dici cap. viii. 4. Sed et hic deliberandum et cogitandum amplius, et quid dicatur, v. 19, δικαιοσύνη, quae sit vitae causa, hoc enim videtur ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. Sed non ut est ingressum παράπτωμα, i. e. voluntarius primi hominis lapsus et ruina, sic et ingressum est χάρισμα, gratuitum Dei beneficium, sive quod Deus gratificatur, quod interpretatur postea gratiam Dei, metonymia causae. Probat

hanc dissimilitudinem imparium collatione, plus posse gratiam ad justitiam et vitam, quam naturam ad injustitiam et mortem. Ubi παραπτώματι unius Adami opponit χάρισμα duorum, quod gratiam Dei, et donum, quod est per gratiam unius hominis Iesu Christi vocat, ubi Deum et Christum uni Adamo, gratiam et donum per gratiam uni offensae opponit. Altera dissimilitudo 16 v. ubi κρῖμα et δώρημα opponuntur, reatus et donum; non ut reatus, qui ingressus est per unum, qui peccavit, quippe Adamum, sic δώρημα donum invectum est per unum, qui peccatum expiavit; quod illustrat imparium collatione: κρῖμα reatus quidem ex una offensa ad condemnationem; χάρισμα vero (videretur dicendum δώρημα, sed non sine causa sic loquitur Apostolus) introiit ex multis offensis ad justificationem; hic uni offensae plures opponit, et κρίματι χάρισμα, et κατακρίματι δικαίωμα; in quibus videre est, omnia, quae gratiae et Christi sunt, efficaciora esse, quam quae Adami et naturae; atque hoc illustrat nova collatione imparium 17 v. Si una offensa mors regnavit per unum, quanto magis, etc. Ubi tria tribus opponuntur, et gratiae supra naturam efficacia amplificatur. Uni offensae opponitur exuberantiae gratiae περισσεία, et doni justitiae, quae est periphrasis χαρίσματος et δωρήματος, quae exposuit in concreto ad majorem emphasin, οἱ περισσείαν, etc. λαμβάνοντες, ut significentur, justificati hoc dono justitiae; Adamo Christus, regnum mortis regno vitae. Atque hactenus contraria, dissimilia atque imparia naturae et gratiae. Hinc infert explicatam similitudinem, 18 v. Sicut igitur per unam offensam (sub. κρῖμα,) reatus invasit omnes homines ad condemnationem; sic per unum δικαίωμα justificamen subiit δώρημα in omnes homines ad justificationem vitae. Hic subaudienda sunt κρῖμα, et quod ei opponitur δώρημα, et παραπτώματι δικαίωμα opponitur ad majorem efficaciam, non δώρημα aut χάρισμα, ut supra, et κατακρίματι non δικαίωμα, ut supra, sed δικαίωσιν ζωῆς opponit ad majorem emphasim; ubi observa in apodosi notam universi generis εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους restringi ad electos, contra quam asserunt universalis gratiae patroni, 19 v., altera similitudo superiorem confirmans a causis; sicut enim per inobedientiam, etc. Ubi obedientia et inobedientia,

constitui justos, et constitui injustos opponuntur, sed comparantur in similitudine contrariorum effectorum; ut inobedientia unius Adami constituit multos peccatores, sic etiam obedientia unius Christi justi constituentur multi; ubi multos in protasi de omnibus dixit hominibus. Constitui peccatores, et constitui justos dixit electos, idque ex una unius obedientia et inobedientia, ut sciamus hic agi non tam de inhaerente, quam de imputata justitia vel injustitia; cum tamen hanc et illa consequatur, quippe imputatam inhaerens. Ideo, 17 v. supra redundantiam gratiae et doni justitiae accipi dixit, quae proprie de inhaerente nobis justitia (quae perquam pusilla, vel in sanctissimis in hac vita) dici non potest, quamvis in futura vita post glorificationem non admodum male diceretur; verum haec redundantia sive exuberantia gratuiti doni justitiae dicta est supra gratia Dei et donum per gratiam unius hominis Iesu Christi, ut nemini dubium amplius esse possit, nisi sponte caecutienti eam uni Christo duntaxat inhaerere, nec alia ratione vel esse, vel fieri nostram, quam gratuita imputatione. Comparavit autem inter se imparium contentione, primo injustitiam sive παράπτωμα Adami, cum justitia sive obedientia Christi, et docet vim et meritum hujus illius vi et merito majus esse, et efficacius, v. 15; secundo comparat κρῖμα judicium sive reatum Adami cum justitia Christi, quatenus nobis imputata nos reddit insontes sub nomine δικαίωματος et χαρίσματος promiscue, docetque plus in hoc esse virium ad nos absolvendos, quam in illo reatu ad nos damnandos, quod reatus sit unius offensae, absolutio vero sit a multis multarum offensarum reatibus, v. 16; ac tertio comparat mortem, cujus regnum grassatur ex condemnatione propter reatum ex unius offensa, cum vita, cujus regnum est multo efficacius atque illustrius ex justificatione propter meritum justitiae Christi gratis nobis imputatae, 17 v. Atque haec de dispari contentione. Similitudo autem haec omnia conjungit, sicut ex Adami offensa contractus reatus omnes addicit morti, ita absolutio ab offensis omnibus ex justitia Christi imputata justificat omnes credentes ad vitam aeternam obtinendam, v. 18. Cujus similitudinis quasi fundamentum altera similitudine illustratur, nimirum: Sicut inobedientia

Adami omnes constituit peccatores, sic obedientia Christi electos omnes constituit justos; ac proinde eo quod justi et injusti constituuntur homines per inobedientiam et obedientiam, hanc Christi, illam Adami, est mors et vita omnium. Ex his autem colligi potest quo sensu Adamus dicatur Christi typus, 20 v. Lex autem praeterea (παρὰ τὴν εὐαγγελίαν, Pisc. praeter promissionem gratiae) ingressa est, etc: Si Adami injustitia satis esset ad omnes homines damnandos, quorsum opus fuerat lege? Respondet, ut irritata per legem naturae contumacia peccatum (Pisc. cognitio lapsus Adami) augeretur, et peccato ita aucto magis augeretur gratia, quo plura et graviora gratis condonantur, eo uberior est gratiae amplitudo. Finis autem est usus exundantis gratiae, 22 v. ut gratia regnet per justitiam in vitam aeternam; quibus verbis gratiam per justitiam vocare videtur, gratuitam Christi justitiam, ut supra; quod regnum justitiae illustrat similitudine peccati, quod regnavit in mortem; ita enim videtur debere illud ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. Causae igitur vitae et mortis ita comparantur inter se, ut omnes in Christo ex gratia Dei mirum quantum efficaciores ad vitam sint, quam in Adamo ex natura ad mortem sempiternam. Unde et intelligi potest, et hanc alteram capitis partem ab 11 v. non minus ad salutis certitudinem demonstrandam, quam partem illam et priorem, ut initio dixi, pertinere: adeo ut totum hoc quintum caput sit de salute per Evangelium conferenda, ut superiora capita de justitia per Evangelium patefacienda, ut 16 et 17 v. 1 cap. propositum fuit.

SEXTUM CAPUT.

Ut morte Christi peccatum expiatur; ita etiam extinguitur impetrato Spiritu regenerante; quare cum justificatione fidei cohaeret sanctificationis beneficium, tantum abest, ut gratuitae justitiae doctrina bonis moribus adversetur, quemadmodum adversarii obstrepere consueverunt. Potest non inepte duplex dici justitia, eaque gratuita, cujus altera sit alterius parens, nisi quis malit utramque

divinae in Christo gratiae gemellas appellare: unde et duplex justificatio dici potest, et utraque gratuita, sed diversa ratione; altera prior naturae ordine, altera posterior: illa simul et semel perfecta, haec tantum inchoata, et suis progrediens paulatim incrementis in hac vita. Altera vitae causa, altera tantum testimonium, sed testimonium et vitae, et prioris justificationis, atque adeo electionis aeternae, ad cujus sensum, et persuasionem in nobis confirmandam huic alteri justificationi studendum est; Illa per fidem, haec per opera efficitur. Sed ne lateat error sub ambiguitate, justificandi verbum aliter de hac atque illa justificatione dicitur: quippe superior justificatio de absolutione a peccatis per imputationem justitiae Christi, posterior de declaratione hujus absolutionis per sanctificationem, ejusque fructus dicitur. Sic Paulus fide Abrahamum justificari dixit, et asseruit secundum priorem; Jacobus Abrahamum ex operibus justificatum scripsit secundum posteriorem, adeo ut de quovis fideli utraque justificatio diversa ratione dicatur. Occurrit igitur Apostolus adversariorum calumniae, quam ex dicto de redundantia gratiae, ubi abundavit peccatum, arrepturos praevidebat v. 20: Ubi abundavit peccatum, ibi exuberavit gratia: laxandum ergo fraenum cupiditatibus, et sceleribus indulgendum. Refutat a contrariis ver. 2. Vivere enim et mori contraria sunt, cui quis mortuus est, in eo vivere non potest; Fide justificati peccato mortui sunt, non possunt ergo peccato vivere. Peccato mori, in dat. casu, dicitur, in quo vis peccati caepit extingui, ut minus sit efficax ad ciendos pravos motus cum Dei voluntate pugnantes. Probat assumptio a fine et usu Baptismi, v. 3. Quotquot baptizantur, in communionem mortis Christi baptizantur, i. e. ut cum Christo mortui peccato commoriantur, quam peccati in nobis mortem obsignat baptismi sacramentum: At quotquot justificati sunt, baptizantur, ergo in communionem mortis Christi baptizantur. Si commortui Christo, ergo etiam consepulti peccato; ut peccati vis extincta paulatim sepeliatur, ut cum Christo resurgamus ad justitiae studium, quam vocat vita novitatem, v. 4. Hujus autem mortis et sepulturae, qua peccato morimur, et sepelimur morte et resurrectione Christi, et resurrectionis, qua cum Christo resur-

gimus ad juste sancteque vivendum, tessera est baptismus, quippe symbolum nostrae regenerationis, cujus duae sunt partes, veteris hominis mortificatio, quam hic mortem et sepulturam vocat, et novi hominis resurrectio, quam illustrat similitudine resurrectionis Christi, quem dicit resurrexisse *διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς*, ad verb. per gloriam patris, i. e. per virtutem et potentiam patris, qui suam gloriam mundo patefecit, Ephes. i. 19. *Τί τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*, i. e. et quae sit excellens illa magnitudo potentiae ipsius in nobis qui credimus pro efficacitate roboris ipsius, quam efficaciter exeruit in Christo excitato eo ex mortuis, etc. ut intelligamus eandem Dei virtutem excitare nos ad vitae novae studium, quae Christum a mortuis excitavit. Haud scio an huc spectet, quod Rom. viii. 11, Si Spiritus ejus, qui excitavit Christum ex mortuis, habitat in vobis, is qui excitavit Christum ex mortuis, vivificabit mortalia vestra corpora per inhabitantem ipsius Spiritum in vobis. Hic "vivificabit mortalia corpora" videtur posuisse pro resurrectione novi hominis, sive studio justitiae in nobis excitando, sed de hoc postea suo loco. Vide num *διὰ δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς* significet formam et modum resurrectionis Christi, qui, ante in morte ignominiosus, resurrexit a morte glorificatus ea gloria, quam a Patre accepit. Ambulare autem in vitae novitate est vitam sancte justeque instituere et transigere. Sequitur probatio resurrectionis nostrae ad novam vitam, v. 5, a communione mortis Christi ad communionem resurrectionis hoc modo: Si participes facti sumus mortis Christi ad moriendum peccato, ut obsignat baptismus: certe participes facti sumus resurrectionis Christi ad vivendum justitiae, cujus symbolum item est baptismus: Sed prius verum est, ut docuit supra, v. 3 his verbis, In Christi mortem baptizati sumus. Ergo et posterius. *Σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν.*] Si complantati cum eo fuimus. Elegans translatio ab arboribus in eadem fossa aut scrobe plantatis et coalescentibus, vel cum multi ex unius radicie surculi insiti per emplastrationem, aut inoculationem succum vitalem trahunt. Similitudinem mortis, et similitudinem resurrectionis Christi vocat communionem cum Christo in morte, et resurrectione, qua vis a morte et resurrectione Christi in nos di-

manat ad perimendam peccati vim, et vigorem vividum sanctimoniae nobis instillandum, quo nos Christo capiti conformes in morte et vita reddamur. Non particulam, Ἀλλα καὶ, Sane et, deinde ellipsin, viz. τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς ἀναστάσεως, viz. σύμφυτοι ἐσόμεθα, i. e. coalescemus conformatione resurrectionis. Explicat v. 6 et 7, mortificationem peccati, resurrectionem novi hominis, 8, 9, 10, 11, veterem hominem vocans nos ut natura corrupti sumus, quae corruptio cum Christo crucifixa ad naturalis vitiositatis radicem, quam corpus peccati vocat, evertendam, ejusque vim et inefficacem et otiosam reddendam; hoc est καταργήθη, ne amplius peccato serviamus, i. e. ultro et sponte peccatis indulgeamus. Rationem addit v. 7, a statu mortui hominis, qui amplius peccare non potest. Nos sumus mortui peccato, vel quod idem est, peccatum est in nobis mortuum, vers. super.; Ergo a Christo vim accepimus, qua fit ne peccato serviamus amplius. Utitur verbo δεδικαίωται, justificatus est, pro liberatus est, similitudine sumpta a damnatorum suppliciis ob maleficia, qui interventu mortis maleficio submoventur.* In superiore disputatione justificare fuit absolvere a peccati reatu: hic vero justificare est, ab ipso peccato et peccandi maleficio et proclivitate liberare. Vivificationem deducit ab hac mortificatione ex communione cum Christo argumento parium: Si mortui cum Christo, vivemus cum Christo, v. 8, i. e. non amplius moriemur in peccatis, quod probat per Christi resurrectionem in vitam sempiternam, qui semel peccato mortuus, amplius non moritur, sed Deo semper vivit, consimiliter hortatur nos peccato mortuos Deo vivere ex membrorum et capitis collatione et conformatione. Atque hactenus fuit doctrina sanctificationis, quae manat a morte et resurrectione Christi, non secus atque justificatio, et quia haec instaurat in nobis amissam sanctitatem et justitiam, cum Jacobo justificationem vocavimus, et ut supra diximus in ult. v. cap. iv. justificationem nostram a Paulo vocari, et beneficium hoc item gratuitum Dei a Christi resurrectione praecipue deducit, ut alterum illud justificationis fidei sive remissionis peccatorum a morte derivat. Nunc vero posita doctrina sanctificationis admovet adhortationum

* Vide Camerarium.

stimulos, quibus nos ad sanctificationis studium excitet, v. 12, et deinceps duplici usus similitudine, altera servitutis et libertatis hoc cap., altera conjugii veteris et novi initio cap. vii. Peccatum comparat durissimo domino, et importuno tyranno, cujus turpissima et exitialis servitus: Justitiam vero clementissimo et benignissimo domino, cujus servitus non tam servitium, quam libertas appellanda, estque tum honestissimus tum maxime salutaris. Nos autem homines pro duplici statu proponit considerandos, ratione peccati et justitiae; natura turpissimam peccati servitutem sponte et alacriter in nostram perniciem servivimus, gratia nunc manumissi a peccato dominum mutavimus, ut non peccato amplius sed justitiae servianus. Sub peccato et sub lege esse pro eodem accipit, quod lex corruptam naturam ad peccandum extimulet; contra sub gratia et item sub justitia pro eodem accipit, quod Dei gratia in Christo nos ad justitiae studium propensos reddit. Atque hoc regeneratis convenit, illud non regenitis. Expellat ergo peccatum justitia, praesertim cum nos, qui natura peccatores, et liberi a justitia sumus, nunc per gratiam liberi a peccato et servi justitiae simus. Μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω.] Ne igitur regnet peccatum, etc. Acquisita quidem nobis est libertas, et in ejus possessionem missi sumus, sed nondum eam plene possidemus: ideo regnandi verbo utitur, quo significatur importuna et violenta peccati tyrannis, qua nos rapit ad omne scelerum genus patrandum. Mortale corpus vocat ipsum corpus, quod morti obnoxium est, cujus cupiditates vocat inclinationes naturales ex infirmitate et corruptione ad peccandum: nisi mavis corpus mortale dici, quod antea veterem hominem cum Christo crucifixum vocavit, cujus intemperies nos ad peccandum sollicitat. Membra nostra vocat, vel partes corporis et vires, vel etiam facultates et potentias animi, quae appellat arma, i. e. instrumenta bene vel male agendi; sumpta similitudine a satellitio armato, hortatur ergo ut vires omnes et facultates tam animi quam corporis, quibus peccato antea plus quam volentes servivimus, intendamus ad actiones sanctas et honestas, quibus servitur justitiae et Deo; uno verbo, nolite peccato sed justitiae servire. Ratio, peccatum vobis non dominabitur, i. e. licet ex parte vos teneat captivos, ejus tamen jugum ex-

cussistis, ac tandem prorsus liberabimini, et in plenam libertatem vendicabimini: A spe igitur hujus victoriae et triumphi hortatur ad acriter pracliandum, et resistendum peccato: rationem subdit, non estis sub lege, sed sub gratia. Lex Evangelio, gratia irae opponitur. Idem ergo sub lege et ira esse, sub Evangelio et gratia esse. Non estis ergo sub lege et ira propter peccatum, ut antea, cum neque justificati, neque sanctificati essetis, cum peccati reatus maneret et peccati vis incolumis vigeret, et ad peccandum valentissima esset; sed sub Evangelio et gratia in Christo, cujus non solum merito justificati, sed etiam efficacia regenerati estis, ut ad peccatum expugnandum, et justitiae graviter militandum idonei sitis propter Christi spem vobis inhabitantem, v. 14. Sequitur hinc orta objectio. Sub gratia sumus; Ergo abjecto omni metu poenae secure genio indulgeamus. Aversatur hanc blasphemiam, et respondet non consequi ex antecedente, quia servi est, parere domino cui subest; nos servi justitiae, non peccati sumus; Ergo justitiae, non peccato serviendum est nobis. Prop. est v. 16, Ass. 17, 18, Conclusio inclusa his verbis Μὴ γένοιτο, absit. In proposito perpetua est translatio, ut jam dixi, a servis, quo spectat illud παρεστάνετε, sistitis ad obediendum. Mortis et vitae meminit, tanquam praemii et poenae, ut hujus metus, illius spes vehementius inflammet animos studio sanctimoniae. Ass. 17 v. gratiarum actione illustrata, qua Deum autorem partae libertatis celebrat, ubi sinceram obedientiam Evangelio ponit pro effecto et signo hujus libertatis; Obedivistis ex animo et formae doctrinae, i. e. Evangelio in quam traditi fuistis quasi configurandi et conformandi. Metaphora a metallorum conflatoribus, qui typis metalla infundunt, ut inde configurentur vasa pro sua cujusque forma. Ἐμφατικώτερον est, traditi estis in typum doctrinae, quam si diceretur, traditus est vobis typus doctrinae nec solum dicit traditos in typum, sed etiam obedivisse, i. e. cessisse et locum dedisse typo imprimendi formam suam, atque ita sibi eos conformandi. Atque haec Evangelio efficacia ad fidem ingenerandam, Rom. cap. i. v. 17, et fidei obedientiam, Rom. cap. i. v. 5, quod ait v. 19. Ἀνθρωπινὸν λέγω, sensus est, se humanitus loqui, secundum morem inter homines usitatum, quoad loquendi formam

mutuatam a rebus humanis, cum interea de spirituali servitute et libertate loquatur. Ideo *διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς* propter infirmitatem carnis, ad mentis ignorantiam referri debet, propter mysteriorum caelestium imperitiam: non quod velit innuere se exigere in studio sanctitatis, quod a carnis imbecillitate proficisci potest, aut in sanctitatis studio se nihil amplius requirere, quam praestet caro, quantumvis imbecilla: nam non a natura, sed a gratia est omnis sanctimonia, et a virtute Spiritus Sancti, cujus spe eos paulo ante confirmaverat. Similitudine illustrat, nisi mavis parum argumento, quam exigat alacritatem studio justitiae: et certe aequum est non minorem operam aut impendi studio justitiae et Deo, quam antea diabolo et injustitiae impendimus: studium vero injustitiae ex eo docet maximum fuisse, quod ita servierimus injustitiae, ut essemus ab omni justitia prorsus alieni, v. 20. Atque hactenus de ipsa servitute, nunc de praemio vel exitu, quem interrogatione urget; peccati quidem fructum nullum, detrimentum maximum, nimirum pudorem ex turpitudine, et metu mortis aeternae, v. 21, contra autem justitiae fructum, sanctificationem; praemium, vitam aeternam, v. 22. Ubi observa antithesin praemii et poenae: *τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια*, v. 23, Stipendia, verbum militare, ut superiora, compensationem ex debito significans, cui opponitur *τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ*, gratuitum Dei beneficium, quo vita aeterna acquiritur. Sic justitia Christi, qua justificamur dicta est v. cap. *χάρισμα* et *δώρημα*, et nunc vita aeterna *χάρισμα θεοῦ* dicitur, adeo ut nullus meritis nostris locus relinquatur.* Atque haec de prima adhortatione ad studium sanctimoniae, illustrata similitudine domini et servi perpetua. Sequitur altera a similitudine conjugii veteris et novi vii. capite.

SEPTIMUM CAPUT.

Lex conjugii haec est, ut durante vita duret vinculum conjugii, altera autem parte mortua dirimi conjugium, et partem superstitem

* Vide etiam an sanctificatio *δώρημα* dicat.

solvi lege conjugii, nec ad officium conjugale praestandum amplius teneri; 3 primis versibus. Hinc infert, nos lege peccati solutos, 4 ver., justitiae studio obligari. Deest assumptio, alteram partem conjugii superioris mortuam esse, adde etiam, nos marito novo copulatos esse. Perstans in similitudine conjugii, bona opera comparat liberis, quos sanctae literae vocant fructus ventris, hinc illa καρποφορήσωμεν, ver. 4, καρποφορῆσαι, ver. 5. Veteris autem conjugii partes sunt, Lex occasione peccati ad bonum inefficax, et ad peccandum corruptam nostram naturam irritans; Uxor autem nos, ut summus natura corrupti. Alterius, quippe novi conjugii partes, Evangelium gratiae sive Spiritus regenerationis; Uxor vero nos, secundum vires omnes corporis et animi, quatenus a peccato liberati sumus. Liberi ex priore conjugio, mala opera, i.e., cogitata, dicta, facta injusta et profana: Ex novo conjugio liberi, bona opera, i.e., facta, dicta, cogitata tam justa, quam sancta. Soluto igitur conjugio cum lege et peccato, non est amplius danda opera liberis ex priore conjugio, i.e. peccatis generandis; et quia sumus alteri marito ex gratia et Evangelio secundis nuptiis conjuncti, danda opera est liberis ex posteriori conjuge, i.e., bonis operibus progenerandis imo quia prius conjugium nostra opera sobole numerosa eaque mortifera valde faecundum fuit, ideo ex posteriori conjugio soboles curanda et propaganda, ver. 5 et 6. Quod quidam putent τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν in priori conjugio, mariti locum occupare, id durum videtur, quod παθήματα patiendi potius, quam agendi significationem habeant, et verbum ἐνεργεῖτο consimiliter, nisi tanquam deponens, aut medium verbum accipiatur, atque ita vertamus, vigebant, non exercebantur efficaciter, ut aliquando putavimus. Membra nostra pro uxore ponuntur in priore conjugio, his verbis, ἐν τοῖς μελέσιν ἡμῶν: ideo παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, quasi peccatorum libidines mariti vices gerere videantur; et illud ὅτε ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, tempus et statum conjugii prioris exprimit, ut et illud καρποφορῆσαι liberorum procreationem, et τῷ θανάτῳ eorum conditionem, vel effectum potius, atque haec 5° ver.; 6° vero solutum prius conjugium, quod cum lege contractum fuit, docet; idque mortua lege, i.e., vi legis irritante corruptionem nostram, quae nos sibi devinctos de-

tinens peccata in nobis progignebat. Unde colligit nos justitiae non injustitiae servire debere, aut quod idem est, Evangelio non legi, gratiae non naturae, novo homini non veteri, et, ut loquitur hoc loco Apostolus, ut serviamus in novitate Spiritus et non in vetustate literae. Literam vocat legem, quatenus est peccati administra: Vetustatem addit, qua significat enervatam esse et obsoletam vim illam ac quasi antiquatam. Spiritus vero nomine, Spiritus regenerationis efficaciam, cui novitatem tribuit, quod autor sit instauratae sanctificationis.

Dubium videri possit ex particula ἀποθανόντος maritine an uxoris mors significetur, propter diversam lectionem: nam quidam libri habent ἀποθανόντες, et sic videtur uxorem respicere: alii vero ἀποθανόντος, quod marito convenit. Et rursus sin de lege tanquam marito, an de peccato, eoque aut marito, aut conjugii vinculo. Verum de hoc amplius. Absoluta hac altera exhortatione et similitudine, occurrit objectioni obortae ex legis mentione, per quam vitiosas cupiditates vigere dixerat. Si per legem peccata patrantur, ergo lex peccatum, i.e., peccati causa efficiens et vitiosa. Adversatur blasphemiam tanquam absurdam, et refutat a contrario effecto legis: Lex arguit peccatum, et latentem prodit, eamque detegit. Non est ergo peccati causa, quod docet exemplo suo tanquam experientia communi, ver. 7. Unde ergo peccata? Respondet ver. 8., a naturali vitiositate, quae occasionem arripit magis ferociendi ex interdicto legis, quae prohibit omne peccatum. Caeterum de cupiditate aut concupiscentia quod affert ex 10mo mandato Decalogi, ideo fit, quod hoc praecepto mali fons obturetur, hominibus magna ex parte incognitus. Vetat enim radicem ipsam, aut saltem primos emergentes fructus, quos ψυχικος ἄνθρωπος aegre admodum damnaverit:* aitque per hoc mandatum omnem cupiditatem in se productam esse, ubi cupiditatis nomine intelligas oportet vitiosos motus verae virtuti contrarios; hoc ideo factum narrat, quod sine legis notitia aut cogitatione peccatum quasi sopitum, et sepultum jacet; atque haec securitas est omnium hominum non renatorum communis, quod suo quoque exemplo non regenerati hominis personam

* Vide Junium in Exod., xx. cap.

sustinens docet, ver. 9. Verum contra simulatque serio de lege cogitando, vitam ac mores nostros cum ea comparamus, mox peccatum, quod antea mortuum facebat, vitam ac novas vires resumit non secus atque calx viva, quae prius frigere visa est, aquae aspersu fumare et inardescere, tetrumque odorem expirare cernitur, ut nos aliquando in gravi argumento nec opinantes oppressi ex tempore lusimus.

Est lapis ardenti quondam fornace recoctus,
Cui nomen calx viva, etc.

Quam vim legis peccatum arguentis, damnantis, atque adeo punientis in seipso expertus suo item exemplo docet, 9 et 10 ver. Verum nulla legis culpa, sed peccati maleficio v. 11 et 12. Quo versu tribuit legi per illationem ex superioribus, sanctitatem, justitiam et bonitatem, sicut 1 ad Timoth. cap. i. 8. Hinc oritur nova objectio, ergo bonum causa mali, aut ex malo bonum. Adversatur et hanc blasphemiam, omnem culpam (ut dictum est) in peccatum et naturam peccatricem conferens, cujus malitia suo se prodit indicio, eoque magis, quod occasione et abusu boni malum patrare contendat; ideoque hanc omnis mali radicem, *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμάρτωλον*, i. e., insigniter et summe peccatricem, *διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς*, dicit v. 13, quod ex eo etiam patet, quod lex natura sua spiritualis sit, nec corpori solum, sed etiam animo spirituales actiones imperet. Verum nos natura nostra carnales, et peccato mancipati sumus, hoc enim est venditum esse sub peccato, non secus atque, venalis servus, et pretio emptus, seu coemptitius, qui turpissime sub jugum missus servitutem servit vilissimam. Atque hoc etiam sub sua persona, causam communem etiam regeneratorum sustinens, explicat nimirum ob duplex in se quasi principium, alterum boni, alterum mali, Spiritum et carnem, sive gratiam et naturam, unde est, ut Spiritus, et novus homo condelectatur legi, et peccatum abhorreat; Vetus autem homo et caro repugnet legi, et peccato guadeat; ex quo legem elucet spiritualem esse, ut cui Spiritus gratiae in regenerato homine consentiat; vitiositas vero naturae omnibus modis pro genio, ingenioque suo reluctetur. Hinc illa gravis lucta sanctissimorum, non dissidium rationis et cupiditatum, ut theologi noi

pauci cum philosophis tradunt; sed pugna rationis etiam cum ratione, et cupiditatis cum cupiditate conflictus propter Spiritum Christi aversum a malo, et boni omnis studiosum, qui mentem, illustrat veri lumine, et voluntatem ad bona impellit expetenda. Proptorea mali culpam omnem, quod in se admittit, transfert in peccatum, quod quamquam in se, tamen ut a se alienum, nec regenerati hominis partem ullam imo, vero quasi esset aliquid extra se describit. Non ego, inquit, facio, sed peccatum quod in me est, v. 20. Et mihi malum adjacet, v. 21. Ideo internum hominem ab externo distingui innuit, v. 22, non negat tamen rebellem illam peccati vim ad mala proclivem in membris suis esse; ideoque vocat legem membrorum legi mentis contrariam et rebellem, et sub peccati jugo quasi captivum mittentem, ac redigentem se quamvis regeneratum hominem, v. 23. Unde cogitur exclamare se miserum atque aerumnosum hominem, et optare liberationem ab hoc corpore non mortali magis quam mortifero. Quo voto mihi videtur non tam velle eum, solvi animam mortis interventu hujus corporis nexibus, quam a peccati pravitate et contumacia, quae cum Dei offensa certam perniciem natura sua affert, liberari. Alii de hac communi morte hoc intelligunt, quod non aliter admiserim, quam si ita accipias, illum peccati pertaesum emori cupere, ne peccat amplius et cum capite Christo conjunctionem in altera vita sine peccato expetere, v. 24. Interea dextre intelligenda verba γινώσκω, θέλω, πράσσω, μισῶ, ποιῶ, ne quis putet illum aut semper velle et approbare bonum, aut nolle et improbare malum; aut semper agere aut facere, quod malum, bonum vero nunquam; sed ut hominem interiorem ab exteriore, sic facultates et actiones interioris hominis distinguit ab actionibus et facultatibus exterioris hominis, et his utitur tanquam peccati administris aut effectis, illis vero ut boni causis, atque effectibus. In summa mentem et voluntatem interioris hominis, i. e. novi et spiritualis, tanquam potentias et potestates usurpat; et sic cognoscere et velle, quanquam sanctarum facultatem sanctas motiones: Carnem, membra, et ni fallor etiam corpus pro veteri homine adhibet, quasi externum hominem, i. e. ut hic innuit, non regenitum designent: agere vero et facere pro functioni-

bus et actionibus externi itidem hominis et non regeniti utitur. Est igitur tropus, Spiritus Sancti spiritualis et peculiaris, quam in his vocibus ignorat philosophia, cum quibus toto coelo erravit olim etiam Augustinus; verum postea virum optimum errorem suum retractare non puduit, quo detestabilior est eorum amentia, qui malint cum multis errare, quam cum Spirito Sancto veritatem profiteri. Verum haec hactenus. Tandem post hanc duram conflictationem, tanquam e desperationis extremo discrimine victrix emergit fides, ac Deo gratias agit in Christo, et concludit se quasi duplicem esse servum, et duobus quasi dominis obnoxium, Spiritui et carni; huic quod ad legem peccati et exteriorem hominem; illi quod legem mentis, et interiorem hominem. Quod dicat se servire legi peccati, non est ita accipiendum, quasi totum se peccato mancipatum censeat, cum mente serviat legi Dei; neque se ita vendicatum in libertatem ut non sentiat carnis motus rebelles, sed se distractum ita a cupiditatibus agnoscit, ut tamen experiatur vim Spiritus, peccato nunc resistentis, nunc damnantis peccatum. Unde nascitur certa liberationis fiducia, quae in mediis jactationum fluctibus affert tranquillitatem. Hinc illa, in quam de subito irrumpit praegestiente laetitia, quasi ad novae lucis aspectum post tristiores illas tenebras, gratiarum actio. Notanda emphasis in duobus praenominibus αὐτὸς ἐγὼ, quibus se et hominem nunc regenitum, et ut regenitorum partes sustinentem, in commune exemplum et solatium renatis omnibus proponit. Subit mentem quaerere, ecquid mens, voluntas, delectatio et delectationis affectio, de quibus paulo ante egit, rudimenta imbecillae sanctificationis adepta, non possent membris et instrumentis corporis sanctificati animi vim expromere, atque edere externis actionibus eadem sanctitate perfusis; quasi agnoscerit inchoatam superiorum facultatum, et quorundam effectuum instaurationem, verum adeo invalidam et inefficacem, ut corpus ipsum regere et externam vitam non possit. Ideo Apostolum dixisse, quod volo bonum, non facio; quod odi malum, hoc ago, et comperio hanc legem volenti mihi facere quod honestum est, mihi malum adjacere; et paulo supra, velle equidem adest mihi, sed ut perficiam, quod honestum est, non invenio, et

quae sunt ejus generis de lege mentis, et de lege membrorum contraria inter se ipso respectu partium et virium diversarum. Denique utrum corpus mortis, unde petit liberationem, v. 24, sit corpus mortale, cujus prius meminit vi. 12, et utrumque massa et substantia corporea, cute, carne, venis, nervis, arteriis, sanguine constans, caduca haec et corruptibilis, ita enim plerique homines sentiunt, nobis vero non fit verisimile, ut supra exposuimus. Concludit ex dissidio et lucta carnis et Spiritus sibi bene sperandi argumentum suppetere, cum inde constet ex regeneratorum numero, quorum personam gereret, esse, ac propterea Deo in Christo gratias agere.

OCTAVUM CAPUT.

Ex his concludit initio octavi capitis nullum damnationis periculum manere sanctificatos, licet veteris hominis reliquiis subinde inquietentur. Sanctificatos, vocat τους ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κατὰ πνεῦμα περιπατοῦντας, eos qui in Christo secundum Spirito incedunt. Ubi est articuli ellipsis; duo enim significantur, eos et in Christo esse, et secundum Spirito ambulare, quorum posteriori opponitur ambulare secundum carnem. Verum quid est esse in Christo? Utrum justificari apprehenso per fidem Christo, an participata vi mortis et resurrectionis Christi ex coalitione cum Christo in morte et vita sanctificari, de qua coalitione cap. vi., v. 4. De posteriori hic agi crediderim qua fit, ut, Christo σύμφυτοι γεγονότες, vitalem et spiritualem succum ad vitae novitatem hauriamus; communionis hujus effectum erit, ambulare secundum Spiritum. Spirituales enim nos prius esse necesse est, quam Spiritualia sapiamus, ut est v. 5, ut omnis fide justificatus sit Spiritualis, i. e. sanctificatus; alia tamen justificationis ratio, sunt enim distincta, licet conjuncta beneficia. Justificamur enim condonatione peccatorum, sanctificamur vero peccati nece, et nostri regeneratione, cujus fructus est omnis sancta actio, quam Apostolus hic vocat ambulationem secundum Spiritum, sive Spiritualem incessum. Sanctificati igitur hic descri-

buntur causae et effecti argumentis. Causa enim sanctificationis est nostra cum Christo unio, quam hic expressit verbis τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ (sub. οὖσι,) qui sunt in Christo, quod complantati cum eo coaluerint conformatione mortis et resurrectionis ipsius. Est igitur conclusio illata ex proxima disputatione de sanctificatione et lucta spirituali, nec tam alte repetita, ut alii volunt, a justificationis doctrina; quamquam et justificationem includat, et praesupponat sanctificationem, cum haec sit illius effectum aut germana soror, et comes individua; nusquam enim sanctificatio sine justificatione. Sanctificati igitur, quique ideo sancte vivunt, sunt extra omne condemnationis periculum. Ratio sequitur, v. 2, quia per Christum liberati sunt a lege peccati et mortis. Liberati, i. e. caeperunt liberari, et certissime plenam liberationem consequentur (hic enim usus linguae sanctae, ut quod coeptum sit, dicatur factum, ad denotandam futurae perfectionis certitudinem, quae expresse ponitur, v. 4.) a lege peccati, a vi peccante et peccati in nobis effectrice, et lege mortis, quae vis in se plane mortifica est et exitialis; ideo supra vocavit eam corpus mortis, a qua flebiliter ingemiscens optabat liberationem. Hujus liberationis causa est lex Spiritus vitae in Christo Iesu, i. e. vis spiritualis et vitalis Christi a mortuis redivivi, quae nos vivificat, et spirituales reddit, ut novam vitam vivere, et secundum Spiritum incedere valeamus; quae vis non est repetenda a conceptu Christi, sed a resurrectione, et haec videtur illa, quam vocavit sub finem cap. 4, δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν respectu futurae perfectionis. Haud scio an haec sit illa cap. v. quam vocat δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, quasi justificationem vitalem atque vivificam, cujus efficacia non per imputationem, sed inhaesionem sancti, atque adeo justi efficimur. Atque haud scio, an justos constitui eodem cap. v. hoc etiam sensu dixerit, et duo Christi beneficia duobus Adami maleficiis contraria conjunxerit, quorum prius justificatio, posterius sit haec sanctificatio; haec corruptioni naturae, illa condemnationi ex reatu opposita. Verum haec amplius disquirenda, nec incompertis temere assentiendum, sed sobrie philosophandum. Nos vi Spiritus Christi sanctificantis plene liberatum iri, ut jam caepimus liberari a lege peccati et mortis, i. e. vi peccatrice et mortifera, probat a causis,

v. 3, quippe Deo Patre, Filio, et Spiritu Sancto, quas et justificationis causas proposuit, cap. iii. v. 24, 25, quas illustrat remotione falsae et inefficacis causae, quippe legis per peccatum ad nos justificandos impotentis, et inefficacis. Ex eo enim quod inquit (hoc est, ἐν ᾧ, i. e. eo quod) infirma esset per carnem legis impotentia, i. e. lex impotens, et viribus destituta esset nos sanctificandi per carnem, i. e. culpa vitiosae naturae, et peccati in ea olim regnantis, nunc inhabitantis; Deus misso Filio suo in carne simillima nostrae carni peccatrici. i. e. natura humana induto, idque περὶ ἁμαρτιάς (sub. θυσίαν) in victimam pro peccato condemnavit, atque adeo crucifixit (supra, cap. vi. v. 6,) et abolevit, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ipsum peccans peccatum, adeoque peccati scaturiginem in hac carne, in corrupta natura nostra; ut τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου, ut justificamen (si ita loqui liceat) legis, i. e. plena legis praestatio, quae legi omni ex parte congruat, in nobis compleretur, non extra nos, per imputationem, quae fit nostra, sed in nobis efficacia Spiritus Christi, naturam nostram omnesque naturae facultates ad plenum justificantis in altera vita; in nobis, inquam, qui in hac vita incipimus carnis cupiditatibus valedicere, et Spiritus Sancti ductum sequi; quod est uno verbo, hic sanctificari, ut alibi glorificemur. Neque enim putandum est nos nec corpora nostra meliora resumpturos, neque animos puriores in resurrectione justorum habituros, quam habemus ex hac vita migrantes. Hic habes patrem, qui filium misit pro peccato ad expiandum peccatum, et condemnavit peccatum, cum damnaret Filium; et cum Filio Iesu Christo crucifixit, atque adeo cum eo interempto necavit, sepulto consepelivit; habes et Filium hominem factum, et victimam pro peccato, i. e. sacrificium expiatorium, in cujus damnatione, crucifixione, morte, sepultura condemnaretur, concrucifigeretur, contrucidaretur, et consepeliretur vis illa peccati vitiosa, atque peccatrix in carne nostra. Habes et Spiritum Sanctum quamquam disertis verbis non expressum, intelligendum tamen ex ejus effecto, quippe extinctione peccati in nobis, et vivificatione justitiae, quod significatum fuit, v. 2, apertius. Lex Spiritus vitae in Christo liberavit me a peccati lege et mortis, et significatur, his verbis, v. 4, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ

ἐν ἡμῖν; ut justitia legis, sive quicquid lex requirit, aut exigit a nobis, id impleretur et praestaretur non naturae viribus, sed Spiritus gratia in nobis plene sanctificatis, et jam glorificatis. Hujus rei certissimum documentum et testimonium, quod hic incipiamus vivere vitam spiritualem Spiritu nos ducente. Unde constat nos spirituales esse nunc saltem ex parte, quod Spiritus in nobis efficacia tandem victrix contra peccati reliquias sit futura; ideo spirituales et dicimur, et sumus; hoc est, quod subjicit, qui secundum Spiritum sunt, (i. e. spirituales) spiritualia sapiunt, ac proinde incedunt secundum Spiritum, quod illustrat a contrario: Et non secundum carnem. Prudentia autem Spiritus est vita et pax, i. e. cum vita aeterna et pace cum Deo (sublatis non solum conscientiae terroribus, sed etiam omni vitiositate, et vitiis omnibus terrorum omnium causis) conjuncta. Vitam ergo et pacem opponit morti et inimicitiae in Deum, tanquam contraria effecta de causis contrariis, nimirum prudentia Spiritus et prudentia carnis. Atque ita ex sanctificatione deducit vitam et pacem hoc loco, ut supra, cap. v. ex justificatione pacem cum Deo, et spem gloriae Dei, i. e. vitae aeternae. Quod vero, v. 3, erat ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ, haud scio an ad carnem Christi referri debeat, quod in ipsius carne damnatum fuerit peccatum non inhaerens; expers enim erat omnis peccati, sed ex imputatione illi impositum, quod nostrum onus in se sustulit. Expende locum diligentius. Ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα.] Plene tandem sanctificabimur, ergo liberabimur a lege peccati et mortis: antecedens, v. 3, et 4, consequens, v. 2. Intellige vi et efficacia resurrectionis Christi, quae consecuta est mortem ejus. Διότι τὸ φρόνημα.] Docet cur sapientia carnis sit mors, quia est in inimicitia adversus Deum. Et quare in inimicitia adversus Deum? quia legi Dei non subjicitur. Et quare non subjicitur? quia natura sua ita est refractaria et contumax, ut subjici Deo nullo modo possit; pugnat enim cum natura Dei, qui est ipsa sanctitas. "Qui vero in carne sunt." A contrariis argumentatur. Qui in carne sunt, Deo placere non possunt: Ergo qui in Spiritu sunt, Deo placent; In Spiritu autem sunt, qui spiritualia sapiunt; et qui spiritualia sapiunt, incedunt secundum Spiritum; Et qui secun-

dum Spiritum incedunt, sunt secundum Spiritum vel sunt in Spiritu, (quod idem est,) i.e. Spirituales et sanctificati, illi Deo placent. Sunt ergo extra omne periculum condemnationis. Vos autem estis in Spiritu quia Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis, ut apparet ex effectis, ergo vos placetis Deo. Οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες.] Propriam significationem particulae δὲ retineo, neque cum aliis verto, igitur; sed de hoc dispiciendum. Habere Spiritum Christi incolam docet a contradicentibus; Qui non habet Christi Spiritum, non est Christi, i.e., Christianus. Initio dixerat nos in Christo esse, nunc vero dicit, Christum in nobis, quorum hujus illud causa videtur esse: prius enim necesse est nos illi uniri, ut in illo simus, quam ipse in nobis sit, per suum Spiritum nos Spirituales efficiens; quanquam haec duo tempore conjuncta sunt, et ratione tantum, eaque forte nimis subtili, distinguantur. Ver. 9. Incipit doctrinam Romanis accommodare, et ex eo quod Christus per ipsius Spiritum incolam et vivificum in ipsis est, colligit, ver. 10, animam jam Spiritualem esse, quippe divino Spiritu vivificatam et sanctificatam; corpus vero mortale et moribundum, quasi jam mortuum esset; verum in resurrectione justorum et corpus ipsum denuo resuscitandum; et Christi Spiritu vivificandum, ut ipsum quoque incorruptibile, Spirituale et gloriosum evadat, ver. 11, et Cor. xv. cap. Causas affert; et cur mortuum corpus? nimirum ob peccatum, quod non nisi morte corporis extinguatur: et cur Spiritus, i.e., anima, quae jam caepit Spiritualis esse, sit vita h.e. vivificata et vivida, adeo ut nullam in morte sensura sit dissolutionem, sed libera corporis vinculis sit victura cum Deo? quia jam praedita est justitia (quae justitia paulatim augescit in hac vita, separatione corporis perficietur,) aeternum victura cum Deo: cur item corpus in vitam resurrecturum et Spirituale futurum? quia Spiritu Dei Patris, qui et Filii Spiritu, qui virtute sua corpus Christi capitis nostri excitavit a mortuis, et corpora quoque nostra, qui Christi membra sumus, est in vitam revocaturus, nimirum Pater in Filio per eundem Spiritum in nobis inhabitantem. Cur igitur vel mors reformidanda, vel causa mortis reliqua vitiositas in corrupta natura regeneratorum nos ad desperationem adigat? cum morte corporis haec sit extin-

guenda omnino, salva et incolumi anima jam Spirituali: cui tempestive conjungetur corpus, non ut antea caducum et vitiosum, sed spirituale et aeternum. Cum morte ergo corporis intellige mortem peccati, et mortificationis nostrae implementum, justitia vero causa ponitur vitae Spiritus, i.e., animae sanctificatae et Spiritualis, qua talis est; quae justitia videtur esse non illa prior, de qua principio Epistolae disputatum, sed haec posterior, quam sanctitatem appellavimus, quae et ipsa suo modo est vitae causa, siquidem ipsa anima dupliciter per naturam mortua est, uno modo ob peccatorum reatum, altero modo ob intestinum peccati virus, idque mortiferum. A morte reatus liberat animam per fidem justificatio, i.e., a peccati reatu absolutio, qua fit ut Deo reconciliati speremus vitam aeternam cap. v. A letali veneno peccati sanctificatio sensim repurgans animam, donec interventu mortis corporeae penitus perpurgetur; ideoque duplicem justitiam, et justificationem supra constituimus. Exigua igitur regenerationis scintilla, quae est in sanctis, est durante hac vita, et justitia dicitur, et vitae semen est. Unde concludit sanctitati studendum esse, 12 ver. ut supra vi. cap., ver. 12, hortatus est ad sancte vivendum; argumentum ab officii necessitate desumptum: obstricti et obaerati sumus spiritui et justitiae, cui vitam debemus, ergo secundum Spiritum vivendum. Illustrat a contrario: non sumus carni obligati, (ut quae sit peccatorum et mortis causa,) ut secundum eam vivamus. Ideoque alterum subjungit argumentum ab effectis contrariis contrariarum causarum, si secundum carnem vixeritis, moriemini, sin vero secundum Spiritum, vitam vivetis sempiternam; quod expressit his verbis, *πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις θανατοῦτε*, Spiritu actiones corporis mortificaveritis; hic actiones tribuit corpori, ut supra cupiditates, vi. cap. 12 ver., utrasque nimirum corruptas et vitiosas, ac proinde ubique corpus corruptum intellige et vitiosum; Spiritui vero tribuit vim mortificandi actiones corporis, quod non est corpus inutile ad omnem actionem reddere, aut corporis viribus et membris nullam actionem edere, sed est a vitiosis actionibus, cujusmodi vitiosae cupiditates efficiunt, corporis membra coercere, et vi Spiritus motus animi rebelles, quibus et corpus ipsum motum cieri contingit, edomare atque subigere. Alterum

igitur argumentum, (sed videtur potius redire ad probandam salutis certitudinem, ut in arg. Ep. supra habetur,) est a praemio vitae aeternae, cujus spe ad sanctitatem incitamur, atque ita argumentatur: Omnes filii Dei vitam aeternam consequentur, qui sanctitati student, vel quod idem est, qui Spiritu Dei aguntur, sunt filii Dei; Ergo omnes qui sanctitati student, vitam adipiscentur aeternam. Probat sanctificatos esse Dei filios: Accepistis Spiritum adoptionis, per quem clamamus Abba Pater, ergo, etc. Cui opponitur Spiritus servitutis rursus ad metum, qui legalis est, ut alter Evangelicus. Et in superiore disputatione, quoties legis facta mentio, intellige Evangelio opponi, ac nominatim ver. 3 hujus cap. Ubi impotentia legis efficacia Evangelii est intelligenda. Spiritus adoptionis dicitur Spiritus ille Dei, qui nobis datus est a Patre in Christo ad Dei adversum nos amorem cum paterno affectu testificandum, nostramque adoptionem obsignandam in cordibus nostris, ut intrepide et cum fiducia Deum Patrem invocemus. Υἱοθεσία Graecum nomen Latino adoptionis est longe significantius nomine. Est enim quasi filii positio; ponere autem Gracce τιθέναι, et interdum Latine est facere; hinc θεὸς non a currendo, ut delirant philosophi, sed a faciendo et condendo mundo; et ponere hominem vel Deum apud Horat. est facere. Huic testi adoptionis nostrae adjungit alterum testem, i.e., Spiritui Sancto Spiritum nostrum, viz., animam Spiritu divino sanctificatam, ut duobus testibus stabiliatur nostra adoptio, et confirmetur nobis nos esse Dei Filios; deo συμμαρτυρεῖ dixit, q. d. Spiritus noster, i.e., anima fide praedita et sanctificata testatur nos Dei Filios esse, et cum Spiritu nostro Spiritus Dei sanctus idem contestatur. "Quod si Filii, haeredes:" sententia proposita: Omnes Filii Dei sunt haeredes Dei, et cohaeredes Christi, ac vitae proinde et gloriae aeternae haeredes, ut subjungit. Additur autem conditio crucis, ad quam ferendam est patientia opus, atque ita incipit praemunire animos contra acerbitatem crucis. Sic v. cap. spei vitae aeternae subjecit gloriationem in adversis, quae generant patientiam. Ideo hic inquit, εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν per indicandi modum, non tam conditionem incerti eventus indicans, quam novum argumentum, et quasi causam afferens nostrae in vita glorifica-

tionis: Siquidem oporteat nos pati cum Christo et perpessionum cum Christo participes esse: Unde et necessario sequitur, nos gloriae Christi fore participes. Quos enim dignatur Christus hoc honore ut pro ipsius nomine patiantur, eosdem est remuneraturus fruitione gloriae suae; non quod perpessiones nostrae, vel patientia nostra tantum praemium promereantur, verum quia ita sibi visum est, ut et Patri coelesti, ex gratuito promisso dare et fidem et patientiam et gloriam aeternam. Interim et magnum est hoc solatium in adversis, Christum habere nostrarum aerumnarum socium, et quicquid nos ejus nomine patimur, id ducit omne suum, non secus acsi ipse pateretur; imo vero nobis quidvis adversi patientibus, et ipse quoque patitur: et quid in dolorem sentiat caput, quotiescunque membrum aliquod dolore afficitur. Verum progrediamur. Alterum argumentum et crucis aequanimiter ferendae, et certitudinis gloriae futurae, per contentionem temporalium perpessionum et gloriae sempiternae, quod prae hac illae sint et leves et momentaneae, ut ad 2. Cor. iv. cap., 17 ver., *τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν.* Notetur verbum λογίζομαι hoc loco, ut supra vi. cap., 11 ver. Et illud *ἄξια* parem aestimationem et valorem indicans in comparatione praesentis acerbitatis aut ignominiae, et futurae gloriae atque laetitiae. Probat autem istius futurae vitae ac gloriae certitudinem a communi testimonio, et intestino sensu rerum creatarum, qui hanc ipsam sollicite expectant. Causam hujus intentae expectationis assignat praesentem statum sub vanitate, cui subjectae sunt, sed non sine spe liberationis: ut enim propter hominem conditae fuerunt, et propter hominis peccatum in homine lapso et illae de statu suo integro collapsae sunt: ita cum homine restituendo et illae restituentur in integrum, quo spectat promissio coeli novi, et terrae novae apud prophetas. Tribuit autem vel rebus sensu et anima carentibus *ἀποκαραδοκίαν*, quasi exerto capite sollicitam atque intentam expectationem, item suspiria et dolores, quales solent esse parturientis, quos laetus consequitur exitus. Jerem. xii. cap., 4 ver. Quae omnia mirifice expressa pudorem nobis incutiant, qui in terram defixi praesentia

curamus, de futuro securi. Praesentem statum vanitatem appellat et servitutem corruptionis, non solum quod illa vanitati et corruptioni sint obnoxiae, verum etiam quod nobis vanissimis et corruptissimis hominibus, cum Dei contemptu et earum abusu, inservire cogantur. Testimonio creaturarum subnectitur aliud sanctorum testimonium atque fidelium, qui dicuntur, hic primitias Spiritus habere; *υἱοθεσίαν* per appositionem vocat *ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος*, redemptionem corporis, innuens adoptionis fruitionem tum demum futuram, cum corpus e somno expergefactum vestietur et ipsum gloria. Atque haec et est spes omnium piorum, quae dicitur nos servare, quod salutem, cujus certiores fide reddimur, patienter expectet. Neque enim est spes eorum, quae cernuntur, aut praesentium, sed absentium et futurorum, atque ita cum salutis certitudine conjungit patientiae documentum, v. 26. Ὡσαύτως δὲ.] Novum patientiae argumentum, Spiritus Sancti in rebus adversis auxilium, qui nostram infirmitatem sublevat, dictans arcano instinctu, quid precandum, et quo modo, nimirum congruentur. Voluntati Dei, qui Deus cum sit *καρδιογνώστης*, suggestas a divino Spiritu suo preces et agnoscit, et exaudit. Magnum est igitur in precibus, imo in Spiritu Sancto, praesidium, quo autore preces Deo gratae et acceptae suscipiuntur. Ubi nota verbum signatum *συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι*, q. d., ad sublevandam oneris nostri gravitatem e regione concurrit Spiritus Sanctus, ut quod non potest efficere nostra infirmitas, perficiat sua virtute. Οἴδαμεν δὲ,] v. 28. Novum argumentum cum mitigandae acerbitati afflictionum, tum salutis certitudini confirmandae: omnia Dei amantibus cooperantur in bonum, ut qui secundum propositum Dei vocati sint, et hoc axioma sibi et Apostolis atque adeo piis omnibus notum, compertum persuasumque esse. Ideo praeposuit *οἴδαμεν*, scimus, et experientia compertum habemus, et approbamus, sicut paulo supra, *οἴδαμεν ὅτι πᾶσα κτίσις*. Hic pios vocat amantes Deum synecdochice ab effecto sanctificationis; deinde utitur verbo *συνεργεῖν*, una operam suam conferre, et vim suam omnem in hoc opus faciendum exerere, ut bonum nostrum et salutem nostram bona omnia promoveant. Sed quae sunt illa? omnia citra ullam exceptionem; Ergo et Deus Pater, et Deus

Filius, et Deus Spiritus Sanctus, et creaturae omnes tam visibiles, quam invisibiles, et bonae et malae; adeo ut reprobi, et ipsi Diaboli quamquam aliud ex suo sensu agentes vel inviti promovere cogantur. Sed quid de creaturis loquor? imo mala ipsa, quae nocitura nobis, et perpessu acerba videntur; et, quod multo omnium admirabilissimum est, peccata etiam nostra, quibus Dei judicia nonnunquam graviora accersimus, huc etiam conducunt.

Sic Deo Opt. Max. visum subinde e tenebris lucem evocare. Ideo adjicit *τοὺς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν*, ut qui vocati sunt secundum propositum; participium enim includit causam, cur mala omnia bono nostro eveniant; neque enim haec proprie causa est quam primum posuit, nos (viz. Deum,) amare; sed haec, vocati efficaciter sumus, idque ex proposito Dei. Vocatio enim ea, quae efficax, naturae ordine antegreditur amorem illum, quo nos Deum amamus; vocationem, aeternum Dei propositum. Cohaerent enim amor Dei noster, et vocatio nostri divina, et propositum Dei, a quo pendet vocatio, ex qua noster in Deum amor. Probat v. 29, Vocatis ex Dei proposito omnia cedere in bonum, quia quos proposuit ab aeterno vocare, et ultro favore suo prosequi, et amplecti amore ut illum redamarent (hoc enim est *προσέγνω*) tam cruci, quam gloriae praedestinavit, nimirum conformes imagini Filii sui. Quae cum sit duplex, una sub cruce ignominiosa, altera supra omnes coelos gloriosa: Ad hanc alia est nulla, quam per illam via; idecque quos saluti et gloriae, eosdem et cruci ferendae, et exantlandis cum ignominia laboribus praedestinavit. *Εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν,*] ut ipse esset primogenitus inter multos fratres; haec est Christi praerogativa, ut primogeniti Filiorum Dei, *ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων*, Coloss. cap. i. "Quos autem praedestinavit, eos et vocavit," &c. Climax sive gradatio, hujusque scalae sunt gradus quinque; *πρόγνωσις*, praecognitio, seu praescitum Dei; *προωρισμὸς*, praedestinatio Dei; *κλῆσις*, vocatio; *δικαίωσις*, justificatio; et *δοξάσμος*, glorificatio. Hic sanctificationis non est expressa mentio, vel quia sub justificatione facile comprehenditur vel sub glorificatione; diximus enim justitiam nobis aliam imputari, aliam inhaerere, et sanctificationis nostrae complementum

est glorificatio. Utitur verbo praeteriti temporis ἐδόξασε, ad certitudinem futurae gloriae significandam, ut v. 2, ἐλευθέρωσε. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα.] Hinc concludit magnificentissime, et cum fiduciae summa gloriatione nobis nihil obesse posse, aut salutem nostram impedire, nihil, quod nobis usui et saluti esse possit, deesse posse. Deus est nobiscum, quis ergo contra nos? Deus dedit Filium suum propter nos in mortem, qui fieri potest, ut aliquid nobis sit negaturus? Aut non omnia ultro gratificaturus et largiturus, cum ne Filium quidem nobis negaverit, sed eum nobis gratificatus sit. Quis accusabit nos, aut criminabitur? cum Deus non solum nos in Christo elegerit, sed etiam justificarit. Quis condemnabit nos, pro quibus absolvendis a peccato mortuus est Christus, et justificandis a morte excitatus est, et glorificandis ad Dei dexteram sedet, et defendendis interpellat. Observa accusationi justificationem, condemnationi defensionem et patrocinium opponi, q. d., quis audeat eum accusare, quem absolvit Deus? Quis condemnare, qui tantum habeat patronum, tam gratiosum et potentem, tam studiosum et amantem sui? Quis nos separabit, inquit, ab amore Christi, non solum quo nos prosequitur, sed etiam quo illum redamamus? Respondet, nihil; enumeratione septenaria rerum praecipue adversarum, probatque exemplo veteris Ecclesiae, Ps. xliv., cujus fides et patientia nullis calamitatibus infringi potuit, aut labefactari, ut Christum nondum in carne exhibitum desereret. Atque ea est victoria sanctorum gloriosa, nimirum invicta fides, quae donum est ejus, qui nos prior amavit, et nobis Spiritu suo indidit mutuum sui amorem. Notandum est verbum ὑπερνικῶμεν, plus quam victores; sumus et quod causam victoriae non amori in Christum nostro, sed Christi in nos amori tribuit, qui nos prior, cum illum odissemus, amavit. Probat deinde, ver. 28, Deum in Christo nunquam nos deserturum aut derelicturum, sed perpetuo et constanti nos in Christo amore prosecuturum. Et illustrat hanc fidei suae persuasionem enumeratione earum rerum, quae quanquam valentissimae videantur, nihil tamen posse creaturas omnes contra Deum creatorem, et in Christo redemptorem suorum ad ejus immutandum contra suos animum, aut potentiam pro suis minuendam. Num

metus mortis? Num amor vitae? Num angelorum sive bonorum sive malorum aut gratia aut potentia? Num res presentes, aut futurae, aut in coelo sublimes maxime, aut apud inferos profundissimae, aut ulla denique res creata? Facessant igitur adulterini Romanenses cum sua dubitatione et ignorantia, ecquid odio an amore digni sint? At ego certo scio illos odio dignos esse, qui Christo non credunt, nec Spiritus oraculis fidem habent. At Paulus, inquiunt, de se est locutus, ut qui de salute sua certus esse potuerit; quid hoc ad nos, qui Apostoli non sumus? Respondeo non suam hic privatam agit causam, sed personam sustinet omnium electorum, haud aliter quam sub finem cap. vii., quod qui ignorat, nihil Christi in salutem novit. Verum regerunt Apostolum uti verbo πέπεισμαι, quod nudam persuasionem significat, eamque interdum vel falsam, adeo ut falli potuerit Apostolus. O os impurum! an aliunde haec persuasio, quam a verbo Dei et Spiritu Sancto qui nec fallere nec falli potest?

Hactenus de justitia et salute in Evangelio patefacta, atque exhibita; de justitia quidem justificante primis capp. iv. Ex qua deduxit salutis certitudinem cap. v. De posteriore justitia sanctificante capp. vi. et vii., unde eandem salutis certitudinem cap. viii., confirmavit.

NONUM CAPUT.

Nunc tribus capp. sequentibus de objectis justitiae et salutis, i.e., personis quibus communicanda est justitia et salus, et quibus non. Cujus tractationis duae sunt partes, quae fere promiscue tractantur. Una est de Judaeorum rejectione, altera de vocatione gentium. Acturus de rejectione Judaeorum gravissima obtestatione odii suspicionem amolitur, et Judaeorum rejectionem eadem opera, quamquam obscurius, et insinuatione usus proponit. Consimiliter initio scriptionis suae cap. i., v. 9, studium et benevolentiam erga Romanos suam commendans, obtestatione est etiam usus. Illic praedicavit Romanorum fidem, hic deplorat Judaeorum infidelitatem. Propositio rejectionis Judaeorum est ad v. 6. Judaei sunt rejecti;

vestit hanc propositionem adjuncto dolore suo :—Doleo Judaeos rejectos esse. Dolorem hunc suum confirmat testimonio divino, sive sanctitate jurisjurandi, et conscientiae testimonio. "Veritatem dico in Christo," i. e. coram Christo teste et judice, atque, adeo falsitatis et perjurii vindice. "Non mentior." Repetitio ejusdem sententiae a contrario, ad majorem emphasim, attestante vel contestante mihi conscientia mea. In testem ergo vocat et Deum et conscientiam, nisi mavis et Christum et Spiritum Sanctum cum sua conscientia, idque sincere et ex animo. Dolorem vero suum appellat ὀδύνην καρδίας, quasi vehementissimum animi cruciatum, qualis parturientium: quem duplici epitheto amplificat, magnum sc. et nunquam intermittentem. Atque haec de dolore, cujus causam exprimit, v. 3, figuratam voto aut optato, quo et amorem insinuat suum erga Judaeos longe vehementissimum, quorum rejectionem, unde tantum dolorem capit, vel suo, si fieri possit, exitio redimere velit, h. e. anathema esse, quasi devotum caput et execrabile: Et addit a Christo (sub. separatum,) contra persuasionem in clausula superioris cap. suam: pro Judaeis, quos multis ornat elogiis, et necessitudinibus sibi devinctos, primum fratres; deinde cognatos vocans suos, (Quaere differentiam;) tertio Israelitas, quod nomen ab Israele ductum, et a Jacobi lucta cum Angelo divinitus Jacobo impositum nomen honorificentissimum; quarto υἱοθεσία dictus a Deo Filius suus primogenitus Israel; quinto δόξα, fortasse arcam cum cherubinis gloriosis aspectabile divinae praesentiae signum intelligit; sexto διαθῆκαι, tabulae foederis in arca duae: nam haud scio an duo foedera, alterum gratiae, alterum operum significet, cum postea mentionem faciat promissionum gratuiti foederis; septimo νομοθεσία, Legislatio, lex fortasse judicialis; octavo λατρεία, cultus, Lex ceremonialis; ut sit Lex moralis, ceremonialis, judicialis distincta ad amplificationem; nono promissiones, promissio de Christo saepe repetita, quae specialium omnium promissionum fuit fundamentum, nisi malis et hanc generalem promissionem, cum multis aliis particularibus indicari; decimo, Quorum sunt Patres: Majorum dignitas, et generis nobilitas; ac denique ultimo, Quod Christus ex Judaeis oriundus quo ad naturam humanam, qui respectu

alterius naturae est Deus praedicandus in saecula. Manifestissimum divinitatis Christi testimonium, 6. v. Οὐχ' οἷον δὲ.] Occurrit tacitae objectioni, quae oritur ex illa propositione de Judaeis rejiciendis, quam insinuavit ingenti suo pro illis dolore. Si Deus rejiceret Judaeos, sibi non constaret, et plurima Dei oracula falsa essent, quod fieri nullo modo potest, ut ipse etiam respondet, Quamvis Judaei rejiciantur. Causam reddit distinctione ambigui. Distinguit enim Israelitas, et Abrahami filios secundum dici, et secundum esse, ut loquitur, i. e. qui nomine tantum sunt ejusmodi et secundum naturalem propagationem: cum verius Israel et verum semen Abrahae sit ex promissione et gratia metiendum. Quod probat verbis promissionis, quibus Sarae, non Agarae filius, Isaac non Ismael, quamquam natura major, et ante Isaacum circumcisus, pro germano Abrahae filio censeatur: In Isaac vocabitur tibi semen. Alterum exemplum illustrius adhuc, Non solum in eadem familia, et ex eodem patre, sed etiam eadem matre simul oriundi gemelli sortem plane diversam subierunt, qui Esau et Jacob, Isaaco et Rebecca nati; quorum natu minor Jacobus Esavo aetate grandiori, vel in ipso utero antequam nati essent, oraculi praedictione praelatus fuit, non ex meritis: nihil enim boni aut mali adhuc fecerant, aut facere per aetatem potuerant; sed ex divina vocatione, atque adeo aeterno Dei consilio, quod Dei propositum secundum electionem vocat, unde pependit vocatio. In oraculo servitus majoris fuit conjuncta cum odio Dei, et minoris dominatus ex divini amoris in Jacobum ultronea promissione fuit, quod ostenditur Prophetae Malachiae verbis. Sequitur occupatio. Videretur Deus injustus, si nulla dignitatis aut indignitatis ratione, alium odio, alium amore prosequatur: posset enim et dignos odisse, et indignos diligere. Respondet sequelam negando, et aversando tanquam blasphemiam; Et scripturae autoritate ex Mose confirmat Deum nullo operum praevisorum respectu ab aeterno pro beneplacito voluntatis suae justissimae (cujus ratio utcunque nos lateat, patet tamen Deo) alios saluti, alios justo exitio destinare: Saluti quidem ex misericordia, quam adhibet, suis gradibus praestanda; hoc est, quod ait Deus Mosi, Miserebor cujuscunque voluerim, commisera-

bor quemcunque commiseratus fuero. Quibus verbis significatur Deum uti clementia, et misericordia in eorum salute promovenda, quos ex mera gratia proposuit ab aeterno eligere: Et cum inter aeternum Dei propositum et consilii executionem miseria hominum ex ipsorum culpa, et Dei misericordia justificandis et sanctificandis in Christo electis interveniat, antequam serventur: non potest Deus videre injustus in iis servandis. Unde concludit prius membrum de electione:—Non esse igitur volentis neque currentis, sed miserentis Dei. Unde hominum non opera modo et actiones, sed etiam conatus et studia excluduntur. Itidem ad alterum membrum de reprobatione respondet Scripturae testimonio, atque adeo Dei verbis, quibus se excitasse Pharaonem ait ad gloriam potentiae et justitiae suae illustrandam. Atque inde concludit utrumque membrum; Electionem et reprobationem a Dei voluntate esse, sed ita ut eligat ex misericordia, et in exequendo decreto reprobationis induret, antequam perdat, idque ex justitia. Quos enim indurat Deus in suis sordibus, nisi sua culpa conspurcatos? Itaque induratio hic praesupponit voluntariam corruptionem, et antegrediens peccatum. Sequitur 19 v. altera objectio, sed pro reprobis tantum: Si indurat Deus quos vult, et ejus voluntati nemo potest resistere, aut impedire quod decrevit, Qui fieri potest, ut jure damnet aut perdat, quos volens induravit? Respondet quidem non negando hanc esse Dei voluntatem, sed ipsam ad orandam, non perscrutandam homuncioni tantum cujus modulus Dei immensitatem non capiat: et homini Deum opponens, cujus voluntas est omnis justitiae regula, os obstruit responsatori: Et prolata similitudine figuli, Deum sic facere, et juste facere ostendit. Augetur similitudo comparatione imparium, Si penes figulum est vasa fingere ex eadem luti massa arbitratu suo in hanc vel illam formam, alia quidem ad honestiorem usum, alia minus honestum, quanto magis potestatem habet Deus in humanum genus, quod ex uno eodemque luto finxit, et ex hominibus alios gloriae alios ignominiae praedestinare: cum ita justitiam et potentiam suam illi visum est illustrare praesertim cum lenitate utatur in homines juste perdendos; quos vocat vasa irae ad interitum coagmentata: cum et hac etiam ratione illustret

suae erga electos misericordiae gloriam. Ubi observa illud *κατηρτίσμενα* a figulo sumpta translatione, nequis putet a seipsis vasa irae coagmentata esse 22 v. Videtur ellipsis ad *πάθος* exprimendum ex rei indignitate, negare Deo, quod homini permissum ab omnibus. Conjunctio *καὶ* ante *ἵνα* abest ab uno exemplari, et videtur redundare; subaudiendum autem, quid absurdi, aut aliud ejusmodi, cum homo tantum possit in lutum non suam sed Dei creaturam? Postquam ita demonstravit justam esse Dei voluntatem in hominibus eligendis et reprobandis, descendit ab aeterno Dei decreto, et occulta voluntate ad ejus patefactionem vocandis per Evangelium hominibus tam gentibus quam Judaeis, imo propheticis testimoniis, duobus Hoseae vocationem Gentium, duobus Esaiae rejectionem Judaeorum confirmat.

His positis causam infert v. 30, tam rejectionis Judaeorum, quam vocationis Gentium: hanc vero solam Dei gratiam esse, quae Gentes nihil tale cogitantes, vel contraria omnia promeritas, veramque justitiam aversantes fidei donatione praevenerit ad justitiam apprehendendam: Judaeos vero studio legalis justitiae veram justitiam contempsisse: hanc vocat *νόμον δικαιοσύνης*, legem justitiae, non tam justitiam ipsam, quam ejus communicandae viam et rationem per Evangelii doctrinam, ut supra legem fidei dixit 8tio cap. sub finem. Quod etiam duobus Esaiae testimoniis confirmat, quorum altero docet tanto ante praedictum, Judaeos in Christum, tanquam in petram scandali et offensionis impacturos; altero Gentes in illum ad salutem speraturas. Quare et abusus legis et contemptus Evangelii Judaeis causa rejectionis fuit ex justo Dei judicio: vocationis Gentium, mera Dei gratia per Evangelii praedicationem, Spiritus Sancti virtute in ipsis efficacem. Est igitur haec summa noni capitis, Judaeos magna ex parte rejectos esse, neque tamen Deum non praestare promissa Abrahae semini et Israelitas facta: quod verum semen Abrahae, et verus Israel, ad quem spectant promissiones, non a natura, sed gratia censendus sit; qua ab aeterno Deus proposuit secum, et elegit in Christo pro beneplacito voluntatis suae, quos servaret ad gloriam gratiae et misericordiae suae; necnon ab aeterno proposuit pro justissima voluntate sua re-

probare et indurare in faecibus sordium suarum, quos juste perditurus esset, cum ad potentiae et justitiae suae gloriam in ipsos declarandam, tum ad illustrandam erga electos misericordiae suae gloriam. Quod aeternum consilium suum patefecit in tempore, vocato Abrahamo ex Semi progenie, et Abrahami filio Isaaco, Isaaci vero Jacobo, ejusque posteris Israelitis, cum interea ceterae gentes alienae a republica Israelis, et exclusae a visibili ecclesia, in suis superstitionibus evanescerent; nihilominus per prophetas praedixit Deus tam Gentium vocationem, quam rejectionem Judaeorum, quod hi Christum in Evangelio offerendum contumaciter rejecturi essent: illae vero eundem fide ex gratia amplexurae secundum oracula Prophetarum.

DECIMUM CAPUT.

Rursus igitur initio decimi cap., nova insimulatione usus, et de suo erga Judaeos studio, et Judaeorum erga Deum zelo protestatus, Judaeos ignorantiae legis convincit ex ipsa lege, et contumaciae redarguit. Itaque duplicem justitiam explicans, legalem et Evangelicam, hanc fidei, illam operum; alteram humanam, alteram divinam; Judaeos suam justitiam ex legis operibus affectando, divinam fidei ex Evangelium justitiam contempsisse, idque, ut dixi, legis ignorantia, nam legis finis Christus ad justitiam cuivis credenti; sic ad Gal., "Lex paedagogus ad Christum." Lex enim lata non fuit, ut quisquam per legem justificaretur; supra cap. iii. ver. 19; verum ut homines suae injustitiae per legem convictos ad quaerendam in Christo justitiam impelleret, non ex operibus, sed fide obtinendam, v. 4. Id ita esse docet ex Mose, descripta tum legali operum, tum Evangelica fidei justitia; illam in legis praestatione impossibili, hanc in Evangelium persuasione efficaci, et salutari fide a Mose collocatam demonstrans. Caeterum prior locus ex Levit. c. xviii., v. 5, quo legis justitia describitur posita in praestanda lege, ut quivis vitam inde consequatur. Alterum testimonium ex

Deuter. cap. xxx. v. 12; describit justitiam fidei verbis Mosis quidem, sed ad Christum applicatis ex sensu verborum, et vera interpretatione. Fides, inquit, non quaerit aut dubitat de verae justitiae vel autore vel indice, ut quae novit Christum patris apud homines interpretem et sacerdotem nostrum, justitiam hanc veram et exhibuisse mundo, et promulgasse, ut neque occulta nunc sit, neque longinqua, quippe in Evangelium exposita, cujus summa est Iesum dominum mortuum esse pro peccatis, et resurrexisse ad justitiam nobis conferendam, et salutem. Cujus utriusque participes sunt, quicunque hoc corde credunt et ore confitentur. Atqui Moses dixit non esse quaerendam in coelo, acsi remota, aut extra mare, quasi occulta esset. Prope enim esse verbum, i. e. Evangelium justitiam hanc patefaciens, idque in ore ut expromptum et in corde ut propinquum. Hoc autem verbum interpretatur Apostolus verbum fidei, quod praedicamus, i. e. ut dixi, Evangelium, quod est potentia Dei in salutem conferendo justitiam et fidem, ac primo fidem. Ideo hic verbum fidei dicitur; deinde justitiam per fidem, ac tandem salutem propter justitiam. Qui ordo causarum hic observandus est, ut id, quod in cap. i. v. 16 et 17, supra dictum est, intelligatur. Diserte hic Mosen docet concionatum esse de justitia fidei, de salute in Christo, atque Evangelio, ipsumque Evangelium esse illud Dei verbum, quod adimat omnem dubitationem de salute et justitia, ad quam per legis opera mortalium nemo pertingat; Christum denique illum esse, qui e coelo descenderit, ut moriendo justitiam nobis et salutem acquireret, a mortuis vero resurrexisse, ut acquisitam nobis efficaciter exhiberet; deducit Apost. ex verbis Mosis fideli interpretatione, Verbum in ore et corde; fidem in Christum, et fidei confessionem ad justitiam et salutem Evangelio exhibitam; et ita quidem ut fide ingenerata praedicatione Evangelii corde credamus Christum pro nobis mortuum esse et resurrexisse ad nos justificandos, et ore profiteamur Iesum esse Dominum, (est enim ellipsis verbi substantivi inter Iesum et Dominum subaudiendi) et dictis et factis Christum exprimamus ad salutem consequendam. In summa justitiam legalem paucis, Evangelicam pluribus describit, et Evangelium illud instrumentum esse

docet fidem fabricandi in nobis, fidem vero instrumentum justitiam in Christo apprehendendi, Christum esse salutem et justitiam nostram, officium vero nostrum credere, et profiteri vita et moribus Iesum esse Dominum, ut qui mortuus resurrexit ad regnum suum ineundum. Atque haec est summa doctrinae Evangelicae paucis apud Mosen verbis comprehensa et Apostolica explicatione illustrata. Haec fidei justitia Evangelica est omnium credentium tam Gentium quam Judaeorum; ut repetito, ex fine sup. cap., Esaiae testimonio, et altero Joelis nunc primum adducto confirmat, interposita ratione sumpta amplitudine potestatis, et munificentiae Christi Domini in omnes, et effecto fidei, invocatione, quae totum Dei cultum complectitur, v. 11, 12, 13. Ex quo intelligas, fidelium ex Gentibus vocationem sic confirmari, ut Judaeorum rejectionis culpa omnis in ipsis resideat ex eorum infidelitate; ad quam convincendam infert Soriten, sive gradationem, ascendendo ab effectis ad causam, hoc modo, ubi invocatio Dei, ibi est fides; ubi est fides, ibi auditio Evangelii; ubi auditur Evangelii ibi praedicationem ejusdem esse necesse est; ubi Evangelii praedicatur, ibi esse oportet, qui divinitus missi hoc munus obeant, quod Esaiae testimonio confirmatur: "Quam speciosi pedes Evangelizantium, etc.," cap. lii., ubi gradus hi omnes enucleate explicantur. Ideo Apost. his paucis verbis adductis digitum quasi ad fontem intendit, unde haurias velim, quae deinde sitim extinguant tuam. Facile colligas ex hac gradatione Gentium vocationem, quam tibi cogitandam relinquit Apost. nec minus Judaeorum credentium salutem. Verum quia potissimum hic stringit aciem styli in Judaeos, quivis hinc videat vel prima fronte eorum, ut qui aspernentur Evangelium, rejectionem; quia licet praedicatum fuit ipsis per Christum et Apostolos Evangelium, Evangelio tamen non auscultarunt, quod tanto ante praedictum per Esaiam, cap. liii., in persona Christi et Apostolorum de Judaeorum incredulitate et contumacia, admirantium brachium Dei, i. e., Evangelium, tam paucis innotuisse. Unde colligit, v. 17, fidem ex auditione, auditionem ex praedicatione Evangelii exoriri, ut constet verbum illud, de quo Moses dixit, propinquum Judaeis esse verbum fidei, quod praedicamus (ut inquit

Apostolus,) i. e. Evangelium, quod qui rejiciunt, fidem rejiciunt et invocationem, atque ideo Iesum Dominum cum omnibus suis beneficiis: cujusmodi fuerunt Judaei. At excipiat aliquis, Judaeos non audivisse. Respondet hoc fieri nullo modo posse, cum jam Evangelium per orbem terrarum Apostolorum praedicatione longe lateque disseminatum sit; eam ob rem initio scripserat, fidem Romanorum in toto mundo celebrari. Verba sunt petita ex Ps. xix. de documentis naturae in mundi opificio, quae traducit Apostolus ad documenta gratiae in Evangelium patefacta; ideoque lineam (i. e. delineationem mundanae fabricae, quae longe lateque conspecta, sine sono quasi vociferatur, et promulgat gloriam Dei) vertit sonum propter Evangelicam praedicationem, quae passim audiebatur. Observa non citari hunc locum ut caetera prophetarum, ad dicendum testimonium, sed prophetae verbis Apostolum tanquam suis uti, ita tamen ut non obscure innuat non minus late patere gratiae praeconium, quam naturae, idque ex sententia prophetae. Ex quo sequitur, non potuisse Judaeos non audire, quod passim et in mundo praedicabatur. Altera objectio pro Judaeis: Finge illos audivisse, at nondum intellexerunt tantum mysterium; quare nimiae severitatis fuerit ob nunc primum auditum, et nondum intellectum nuntium, Dei populum damnare. Resp. primum ex Mosae, deinde ex Esaia mysterium hoc de gentium vocatione, et rejectione Judaeorum, et jam pridem innotuisse: nam Moses, Deut. xxxii. in divino carmine Deum loquentem inducit, et interminantem se Judaeos rebelles Gentium obedientia ad aemulationem provocaturum. Esaias vero lxv., magna cum fiducia, tam de Judaeis, quam Gentibus Christum loquentem inducit, harum quidem de improviso nec opinatam vocationem et repiscentiam, illorum vero deploratam contumaciam duobus ultimis versibus.

UNDECIMUM CAPUT.

Tertia objectio sequitur initio cap. xi.; Sit ita, dicat Judaeus, et nos audivisse, et jam pridem ex Mose, et Esaia nosse potuisse, atque adeo cognovisse haec, an Deus propterea rejecerit populum suum? Cui objectioni respondet, Minime; ut qui foedus pactum jam olim cum populo suo constanter servet, nec universitatem, aut corpus populi sui abdicasse, quod probat ἐνστάσει* primum singularis exempli sui, qui cum sit Israelita, ex Abrahamo e Binjaminica tribu oriundus, gratia Dei factum est, ut sit Christianus et Apostolus: ergo non omnes rejecti, i. e. universi et singuli; tollitur nomen universale data vel una singulari instantia. Deinde distinctione populi, quod alius gratia, alius natura sit populus Dei; alius specie genus, alius re ipsa. Verus autem Dei populus, et solus qui hoc nomen meretur, quem ex gratia praecognovit ab aeterno et elegit in Christo: ex hoc populo ne unum quidem rejicit, aut rejectus est, v. 2. Postremo profert alteram ἔνστασιν, vel exemplum diebus Eliae, v. 2 et 3, cum nullus verus Israelita ab oculatissimo propheta conspici videretur, et propheta, contra omnes tanquam apostatas ex sanguinarios prophetarum carnifices Deum imploraret. Tum enim edoctus oraculo dedicit multa Israelitarum millia septenario numero indicata, se cultibus idolorum non polluisse, v. 4. Concludit hujus exempli similitudine reliquias ex gratia secundum electionem salvas esse, v. 5. Et instituta gratiae cum operibus contentione, docet gratiam et opera simul stare non posse, quin opera gratiam funditus evertant, et contra, ver. 6. Ne quis putet pios Judaeorum majores operibus, non gratiae salutem acceptam retulisse, qui locus Semipelagianos Romanenses refutat divinitus, hinc infert per occupationem frustra Israelitas quaesisse justitiam ex legis operibus; interea exiguas reliquias etiam nunc ex gratuita electione vocari, ceteros sua culpa occallescere ex justa Dei vindicta obtenebrantis eorum mentes, et animos obfirmantis, Davide

* [i. e. *Instantia*, qua affertur opinio quaedam (δόξα τις) ad persuadendum apta. Cf. Aristot. Rhet. ii., 25, 26.]

et Esaia testibus, 7, 8, 9, 10. Atque hactenus docuit magnam partem Judaeorum, salvis tamen ex gratia reliquiis, exhaeredatam esse, nunc a v. 11 ad 17, finem assumit duplicem subordinatum gloriae Dei, cur illi visum multitudinem Judaeorum maximam ab Ecclesia separare, quorum alter Gentium, alter Judaeorum bono inservit. Prior finis, ut occasione hac pateret locus vocandis in ecclesiam Gentibus; posterior, ut aemulatione Gentium provocarentur etiam Judaei, ad Deum amplexandum. Non ideo igitur impegerunt, ut prorsus prolabantur, i. e. ita defecerunt, ut aut nulli usui sit eorum defectio, aut ut sit perpetuo duratura ex odio Dei in populum suum, v. 11. Illustrat hos duos fines, v. 12. Et ex priore deducit posteriorem auctum novo argumento, quippe majore Gentium et ecclesiae bono, quem finem posteriorem probat exemplo suo, qui eo etiam diligentius fungitur Apostolatu suo inter Gentes, ut gentium exemplo Judaei provocentur ad sanctam aemulationem, ut si quo modo fieri possit, ut ex ipsis aliqui serventur. Ubi Judaeos carnem suam, i. e. consanguineos vocat, 13, 14. Quod studium suum confirmat ab eventu, nisi mavis effecto utili etiam Gentibus ex aemulatione Judaeorum, amplificato minorum comparatione, v. 15 et 16. Denique eandem vocationem Judaeorum probat argumentis parium, duplici similitudine illustratis, Abrahamum primitiis et radici, Judaeos massae et ramis conferens; ut massa in primitiis sanctificatur, et rami in radici, ut qualis radix, tales sint rami: ita in Abrahamo posteri foederis ratione sunt sancti, quod non de singulis intelligendum, ut diximus supra; vide 1 Cor. vii. 14; Levit. cap. xxiii. v. 14. Ex hac sanctificatione posteriorum Abrahami, i. e. Judaeorum retenta similitudine radicis et ramorum, admonet Gentes, ne ferociant, aut Judaeis insultent. Ubi emplastrationis sive inoculationis significationem observa in verbo ἐνεκεντρίσθης, quod Cic. dixit *infundi*,* i. e. in fissum trunco inseri, sic infundi in genus aut familiam. Interea beneficium gratiae commemorat in Gentes collatum, facta mentione prioris status, quem comparat cum oleastro, qui nunc insitus nativae oleae radici, ejus

* [Sic in MS., seu aliquam errorem vel in auctore vel in exscriptore hoc loco quidquid suspicor inesse, ut opinor, apud Ciceronem occurrit hoc verbum.]

succum et pinguedinem trahit; atque ob hunc meliorem statum Gentes Judaeis propter Abrahamum, cui quasi insitae sunt, obligantur. Ne ergo Gentes insultent Judaeis, qui sunt rami nativi, cum illae sint oleastri, nec sanctum genus sustentent, sed ab eo sustententur, v. 17, 18. Occurrat Gentilis:—Illi sunt recisi meae insitionis gratia, ut mihi jure liceat illos despicere. Resp. confessione, et assumptione verae causae, quippe infidelitatis Judaeorum, et gratiae Dei erga Gentes; quod hae insitae, illi excisi: non igitur dignitate sua promeruerunt Gentes, ut in Judaeorum locum venirent, ac proinde nihil sibi hoc nomine debent tribuere, nec contra Judaeos insolenter gloriari; sed cum timore, et cum tremore, ut ait alibi Apostolus, suam salutem conficere. Rationem subdit hujus reverentiae et metus a justitia Dei severa in Judaeos, quibus non pepercit, licet ramis naturalibus, quanto minus tibi oleastro, a minorum collatione. Ubi nota in his omnibus εἰ particulam non dubiam conditionem, sed certae veritatis significationem habere, ver. 19, 20, 21. Inde proponit ἀντίθεσιν benignitatis et severitatis divinae quarum hac contra Judaeos, illa adversus Gentes est usus, et potest vice versa in Gentes severitate, et erga Judaeos benignitate uti, si vel Judaei resipuerint, vel ferociverint Gentes. Posse autem id Deum minorum probat comparatione, retenta superiori similitudine ramorum, et radicis; Si in locum rami nativae oleae excisi insevit oleastrum, quanto facilius potest nativae oleae ramum suae radici infindere, i.e., Gentes, si infideles evaserint, ex sancta Ecclesia ejicere: Judaeos, si ad fidem reversi fuerint, in sanctorum communionem recipere, ut cum Abrahamo, Isaaco et Jacobo (ut loquitur Deus) accumbant, ver. 22, 23, 24. Quod dixit Deum posse facere, ver. 25, affirmat plane facturum, quoad Judaeos, quorum excisionem tantum ex parte esse, et ad tempus fore docet; atque hoc mysterium vocat, quod continendis in officio et modestia Gentibus revelat, confirmatque divino Esaiae testimonio duplici, ver. 26, 27, in unum contracto. Apostolus totum Israelem salvum fore docit, non quod singuli sint servandi, ut neque per πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν omnes et singulos ex Gentibus intelligit. Causam restitutionis Judaeorum repetit a decreto electionis gratuito, et Dei in

patres propter Christum benevolentia, et illustratam contraria causa rejectionis probat sequenti, ver. 29, ab immutabilitate Dei, cujus ut decretum, ita promissum est irrevocabile, 28, 29, et rursus illustrat simili misericordia erga Gentes, et argumento imparium, ver. 30, 31. Atque hanc comparationem probat a fine divini consilii, quo per severitatem sibi munit viam, et gradum facit ad misericordiam. Ideo enim Deus omnes conclusit sub peccatum et rebellionem, ut omnium misereatur. Ubi observa τοὺς πάντας, cum articulo significare electos omnes et servandos, tam ex Judaeis, quam ex Gentibus. Quare inscite, nequid gravius dicam hic locus a quibusdam detorquetur, ad universalis gratiae probandum delirium. Concludit totam hanc tractationem jam inde a cap. ix., de electione et reprobatione, vocatione et rejectione tam Judaeorum, quam Gentium, admiratione sapientiae divinae, justitiae et ἀνταρκείας, ne quis cum Deo expostulet de judiciorum severitate, aut consilia ad exiguum suae rationis modulum exigat; tantum abest, ut cui quicquam debeat, ut ei omnia et creationem, et sui debeant conservationem; proinde aequissimum, ut ad ejus gloriam omnia referantur. Ἀνεξιχνίαστα imperscrutabilia, et ἀνεξιχνίαστα, impervestigabilia; translatio prior ab aurifodinis, aut defosso auro: posterior a venatoribus, aut abigaeis, ad quorum vestigia persequenda adhibentur odorisequi canes. Observa praepositiones ἐκ et διὰ Deo tribui, qui est plus quam causa efficiens tam procreans, quam conservans rerum omnium: quarum praepositionum prior ad efficientiam Dei in procreando, altera ad efficientiam Dei in conservando; quemadmodum et tertia de fine dicitur, qui est rerum omnium summus et ultimus, nimirum gloria Dei, quam si unus ipse omnem in solidum promeretur, sane in societatem gloriae admittat neminem, ut apud Prophetam, gloriam meam alteri non dabo. Quid ergo de materia et forma, causisque physicis in ἀπροσίτοις statuendum? sunt ne principia essentiae aut causae motus, aut quietis in rebus naturalibus! Sed de his alias.

DUODECIMUM CAPUT.

Hactenus de doctrina justitiae et salutis, deque earundem objectis, et causis omnibus, quae fuit prior pars ejus, quam τὸν λόγον et quasi corpus epistolae appellavimus. Sequitur ejusdem pars altera, quae ad disciplinam praecipue spectat, et in adhortationibus ad sanctimonium, et vitam Christianam pertinentibus posita est: Graeci παράινεσιν vocant: usque ad cap. xv. ver. 15. Quae quidem aut universales sunt, aut particulares, et hae rursum vel Ethicae, vel Politicae, vel Hieraticae. De Ethicis post universalem adhortationem, cap. xii; Politicis, xiii; Hieraticis, xiv. et parte xv. Primum igitur est universalis παράινεσις ad omnem sanctimoniam spectans, 3 primis ver. Deinde accommodata muneribus et functionibus Ecclesiasticis, ver. 9. Cujus summa est, Studete verae sanctimoniae, quae est secundum sanam sanctamque prudentiam; hujus sanctimoniae summa et unica regula est sola Dei voluntas, ver. 2, praescripta verbo Dei ver. 1. Modus utendi hac sanctitudine, prudentia Spiritualis secundum modulum gratiae et demensum fidei cujusque, ver. 3. Subjectum corpora nostra, ver. 1, animi, ver. 2, et utriusque vires et motus omnes. Partes sanctimoniae duae, veteris hominis mortificatio, et vivificatio novi; haec transformationis nomine, ver. 2, illa verbis sistendi corporis in victimam significatur, ver. 1, translatione sumpta a victimis legalibus, ut veterem sc. hominem, quem corpus vocat, cum omnibus suis cupiditatibus cultro verbi divini quasi victimario jugulemus. Hujus victimae tres adjunctae conditiones reguntur ut sit sancta in se a Spiritu sanctificante; sit accepta Deo a justificatione in Christi sanguine, qua expiatis peccatis nostris Deo reconciliamur, et grati acceptique sumus; denique sit logica λατρεία, i.e., cultus praescriptus verbo Dei, et spiritualis, hoc enim logicum hoc loco, ut 1 Peter ii., λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα, παρὰ τὸι λόγον, unde et λογία τοῦ θεοῦ cap. iii., et λογιά ζοντα 7 act. et λογεῖον apud LXX., quod rationale videtur non bene versum Latine, sed oraculum seu oraculare vertendum fuit; ad quod oraculum, i.e., divinae voluntatis in verbo

Dei scripto patefactionem exigenda est nostra omnis sanctificatio; non ad rationem naturalem, sed ad Spiritum Dei, ut noster cultus non rationalis sit, sed Spiritualis. Atque haec sunt ex uno Christi sacrificio proficiscentia, et relicta Christianis omnibus communia sacrificia. In conditionibus sanctum profano, acceptum inviso, spirituale carnali, sive praescriptum verbi Dei humanis traditionibus opponitur. Pene oblitus sum quartae conditionis, quae ordine prima, in victimam vivam; opponi videtur victimis legalibus mortuis, quod haec mactatio veteris hominis nos vivificet, vivosque reddat vi vitae Christi redivivi. Huic mortificationi opponitur *συσχηματίζεσθαι τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ*, configurari saeculo huic, quasi simili habitu indui, et referre speciem mundanorum hominum, quorum opiniones pro exemplo vitae et morum vetat indui. Nihil igitur magis, dedecet Christianum, aut alienum ab ejus officio, quam mundi hujus, *ὃς ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται*, imitatio; ita enim mundo versandum nobis, ut in sententiis, et dictis, et factis, vita denique et moribus dissimillimi comperiamur. Huic mundano habitui et consuetudini opponit *μεταμόρφωσιν*, externae figurae internam transformationem facultatum superiorum mentis et voluntatis a Spiritu regenerante profectum; ut ipsa etiam actionum regina voluntas, et ratio domina suam quasi formam exuant, et induant novam Spiritualem formam, verum quae non sit essentia animae, sed qualitas essentiam vestiens et ornans, quae transformatio mentis et voluntatis est; utramque enim mentis nomine intelligo, sed praecipue facultatem voluntatis, cui intellectus praeire debet veri lumine praelucens bono voluntatis objecto, quo voluntas in id propendeat *εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν*, ut probetis quae sit Dei voluntas. Hujus transformationis finis est conformatio cum Dei voluntate, ut postquam exploratum et compertum habuerimus, quid voluerit Deus, id approbet et eligat voluntas nostra sibi nimirum nunc ut gratum et acceptum. Itaque voluntas Dei hic ponitur pro eo quod Deus vult nos facere, et quod nolens praescripsit nobis faciendum hoc autem tribus adjunctis ornatur, bonitate, acceptatione, et perfectione, quae tria pendent ab essentiali voluntate Dei, quae est ipsa bonitas Deo acceptissima, in se perfectissima, atque adeo ipsa perfectio, haec igi-

tur Dei voluntas sit instar archetypi, in quem nos quasi immissi et traditi, ut cap. vi. est locutus, ei conformemur, ut nostra voluntas sit ἔκτυπος, i. e. impressa et informata ab illa, ut sit bona, accepta, ac perfecta, et studio ducatur hujus perfectae bonitatis, ut Deo grata sit. Quid enim Deo gratum esse potest, quod cum sua voluntate pugnat? Et quae voluntas non grata Deo, quae divinae voluntati conformis est? Atque haec est illa nostrae omnis sanctificationis et sanctimoniae, ut dixi, regula et norma; quae cujusmodi sit, ne eam ignoremus, subjecta ratione docet, quam alte repetit ab autoritate, et protestate Dei in Christo legislatoris, cujus ipse interpres atque apostolus, gratia sibi concessa; ut edicat et promulget vitae nostrae regendae leges, et hunc universalem imprimis omni homini Christiano communem; hoc enim est, πάντι τῷ ὄντι ἐν ὑμῖν. Observa hic autoritatem apostolicam divinitus imperiosam, ex regis et domini nostri voluntate. Sequitur lex ipsa universalis sive edictum apostolicum his verbis, φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, sapere sive potius prudentem esse ad sanam prudentiam, i. e. modestiam sanctam et spiritualem, ut nostra prudentia omnis σωφροσύνῃ temperetur, et Christiana modestia; quod praeceptum illustrat primum a contrario, Μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὁ δεῖ φρονεῖν, ne sapiamus aut prudentiam affectemus supra viros, atque officium, praeter id quod sapere debemus, aut praeterito eo (hoc enim est παρ' ὁ) in quo prudentes nos esse, et intra quod modum prudentiae nostrae continere nos convenit. Deinde efficiente causa Deo, et modulo gratiae Dei, sive demenso fidei, cujus meta et quasi repagulis nostram prudentiam omnem in ordinem cogit atque coercet, dum inquit, unicuique, ut Deus partitus est mensuram fidei (quidam codices habent χάριτος), cuique igitur sua spectanda fides h. e. cognitio divinae voluntatis in Christo, et de ea certa animi persuasio in omni re suscipienda et agenda. Quicquid enim (ut dicit postea) sine fide sit, peccatum est, quo fere spectat et gratiae nomen, si ita legamus, nisi quod apertius fidem includere videatur, cum sapientiae sive prudentiae dono, pro muneris et functionis ratione. Nec fides modo, sed etiam mensura fidei spectanda, i. e. demensum illud nobis tributum, nec tam spectandum quid aliis concessum, aut

quam praeclara sit res suscipienda, quam quid nobis tributum, quis nostrae prudentiae modulus, quod vitae genus, ad quod vocati sumus. Neque enim immensum est demensum nostrum, neque infinita vocatio, sed utrumque suis finibus et limitibus circumscriptum, ultra quos qui progreditur, ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐκάμμενα (ut ait Graecum proverbium) πηδᾷ, et vagatur extra oleas, non sine vitio πολυπραγμοσύνης, et ambitionis crimine; qua se et alios inutiliter fatigat, et disturbat sanctam societatem, quam corpori comparat, ut postea dicemus. Atque haec est illa generalis ad sanctitatem adhortatio: cujus adhortationis quasi stimuli sunt οἰκτιρμοὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, commiserationes Dei, per quas gravissime obtestatur apostolus ut sanctimoniae studeamus, et voluntatem Dei in verbo patefactam, pro modo revelationis nostrae, cum vocatione nostra ob oculos habeamus. Commiserationes Dei vocat beneficia Dei in Christo omnia ex misericordia et affectu quasi paterno in nos collata quae alte repetivit in superiore doctrina a fonte aeterna electionis, et divini propositi, ex quo dignatus est nos vocare per verbum Evangelii ad participandum in Christo vi Spiritus sortem sanctorum, i. e. gratuitam justitiam et salutem. Et sane non possunt adhiberi faces ardentiores ad animos studio officii inflammandos, quam tantorum beneficiorum commemoratio, quorum ult. ver. superioris cap., Deum autorem, ac proinde ad ejus gloriam referenda, praemisit. Huc spectat illativa particula οὖν ex superiori doctrina omni inferens hanc adhortationem ad omne vitae Christianae officium, ver. 4 et 5. Tertia illustratio per similitudinem corporis et membrorum. Unius corporis multa sunt membra, quae singula cum diversa sint, diversas habent actiones, et diversas agendi facultates. Membrorum nomine partes corporis organicas animi functionibus exponendis idoneas significat. Atque haec protasis similitudinis ver. 4, apodosis ver. 5. Sic nos multi, tanquam membra unius corporis, in capite Christo sumus: singillatim alii inter se aliorum membra, i. e. membrorum inter se omnium ad incolumitatem totius corporis, et singulorum membrorum summa conspiratio est, atque conjunctio. Quam similitudinem divinitus explicatam vide 1 Cor. cap. xii. Ad hoc ut simus viva hujus cor-

poris membra, et functionibus obeundis idonea, data sunt nobis χαρίσματα, i. e. officia et munere cum donis pro officiorum et munerum diversorum ratione diversis; nisi mavis per χάριν δοθεῖσαν intelligere officia et munera; per χαρίσματα dona gratuita, quibus idonei reddimur quisque suo faciundo officio, et muneri fungendo. Rom. i., 11, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικόν. Ubi incipit illustrare commune et universale prudentiae praeceptum distributione munerum ecclesiasticorum, et ad eorum rationem accommodatione; quibus omnibus hoc commune est, ut secundum fidei analogiam, quam μέτρον πίστεως vocavit, v. 3, et gratiae dimensum obeantur; ut silicet quisque quocunque munere fungendo intra vocationis et revelationis suae modum se contineat. Ac fortasse etiam, imo procul omni dubio, non solum ad mensuram, et proportionem fidei suadet exigere functiones ecclesiasticas; verum etiam secundum eandem fungi omnibus omnium Christianarum virtutum sequentium tam moralium, quam politicarum officiis; nam (ut dixi) universale praeceptum Christianae prudentiae ad haec omnia pertinet. Sit zeugma a priore, quo illud κατὰ ἀναλογίαν πίστεως repetatur in omnibus membris, et sententiis exhortationum sequentibus; et ἔλλειψις verbi vel proximi ἔχωμεν, vel potius remotioris φρονῶμεν κατὰ ἀναλογίαν πίστεως, membratim ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ repetendi. Distinguit munera ecclesiastica cum suis donis in prophetiam cum donis propheticis, et διακονίαν cum donis ejusdem: prophetiam rursus in docendi et exhortandi munus, cum donis cognitionis et sapientiae, quorum hoc pastoris, illud doctoris, 1 Cor. xii. Quod subditur ὁ μεταδιδοὺς quamquam ad διακονίαν alii referant, moveor tamen in praesenti ut dubitem, an ad prophetiam referri possit, cujusmodi tractatur toto xiv. [prioris] ad Cor. qua duo vel tres, et modo ordine fiat, omnes prophetae loqui permittuntur; hoc enim videtur esse μεταδιδόναι, quasi impertiri, et pro virili parte conferre pro se quisque, quasi ἔρανον, et symbolum. Jac. cap. i. v. 5. δίδοντος πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς, de Dei benignitate magnificentissima dicitur, fortasse et hoc loco de liberali in pauperes beneficentia. Sed nihil affirmo, et hoc quoque amplius deliberandum. Simplicitas duplicitati opponitur: Oculus simplex Matt. vi. πονηρὸς

opponitur, i. e. integer vitatio aut corrupto: hoc sensu tam prophetiae, quam διακονίᾳ proprie dictae conveniat. Integritas enim sincera non minus ἐν τῷ ὀρθοτομεῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, quam in eleemosynarum distributione requiritur: Sed esto (quod apud alios obtinuit, et in hanc usque diem mihi persuasum fuit) hoc de Diaconis dicatur et intelligatur, nam et Macedoniorum expromptum in sublevandis pauperibus beneficentiam ἁπλότητα vocat Apost. 2 Cor. viii. et Deus dicitur dare ἁπλῶς, Jac. i. Διακονία ergo in genere in tres partes tribuitur, in διακονίαν proprie dictam, officium eorum, qui bonorum Ecclesiasticorum (quae tributa pauperum vocantur a veteribus) quasi promicondi et dispensatores sunt: in censuram morum, quam praefecturam seu praesidentiam vocat, προστασιαν Graece (vide num hoc quoque ad praefectos in quoque ordine Ecclesiastico referatur, ut qui apud Israelitas praefecti diversis Levitarum ordinibus, ἄρχοντες olim dicti) in quorum praefectura administranda requiritur diligentia; tertia species διακονίας, miserendi verbo exprimitur, casibus, et aegrotis sublevandis, et propius curandis occupetur: cujusmodi munus fuisse videtur illius viduarum collegii, cujus meminit 1 Timot. v. in quo ministerio fungendo requirit hilaritatem, ut alacritatem praesient in munere suo, deponentes molestias, quas haec habet curatio; ut tanto magis morbidi, qui plerumque morosi esse solent, exhilarentur. Non nemo hoc ad totam Ecclesiam refert, saltem ad eos omnes, qui de suo erogant aliquid in usum tenuiorum, et sane Apost. 2 Cor. cap. ix. ver. 7, ἱλαρον δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ Θεὸς. Atque haec sunt munera, quae ut apparet ex hoc loco in Ecclesia Romana tum fuerunt constituta, et in omni Christiana Ecclesia ordinarie constituenda: quorum si quod vel unum deest, hoc ipso mancam illam et mutilam singularem, Ecclesiam esse Spiritus Sanctus arguit: nec plura his in Ecclesia bene constituta munera locum habent, cum hic instituerit Apost. Ecclesiasticorum munerum ordinariorum perfectam distributionem: alioqui Spiritum Sanctum aut oblivionis insimulemus, aut incurantiae; Sed absit verbo contumelia.

Sequuntur praecepta Ethicae Christianae Christianis omnibus item communia: in quibus praeceptis exercendis secundum fidei

analogiam versandum; ut scilicet pro vocationis et gratiae modulo Christianas virtutes omnes excolamus. Praecepta haec non sunt ita temere confusa, ut vulgus existimat, aut ut fieri solet a profanis hominibus in sententiis de vita et moribus congerendis. Nam de amore sive charitate primum agit, quam simulatione et fuco vacare, et sinceram esse vult, studiumque omne nostrum, et cupiditatem abhorrere ab eo, quod alteri molestum aut damnosum sit, adhaerere vero velut conglutinatum ei, quod proximo sit profuturum v. 9. Ubi in singulis Ellipsis est verbi substantivi. Huc spectat fraternus amor, φιλαδελφία, et quasi parentum in liberos φιλοστοργία; quibus duobus vocabulis commendat Christianis non vulgarem benevolentiam, sed summum amorem, cujusmodi debet esse fraternus, et parentum in liberos affectus, isque mutuus ut inter se ament alii vicissim alios, singuli universos, et universi singulos: hoc enim est εἰς ἀλλήλους. Hinc pensio et promptitudo aliorum ad alios honore prosequendos, et omnes in pari dignitatis gradu sibi praeferendos. Atque hoc quasi primum caput, v. 10. Secundum est sedulitatis et diligentiae. Studium ergo requirit, excusso veterno, seriam et assiduum in bono, ut nullus neque socordiae, neque segnitiae detur locus, neque id tantum conatu naturae, et virium naturali incitatione, sed ardore Spiritus Sanctus et pio zelo, quo inflammatus animus ad omne sanctum officium quasi rapiatur: atque ita Domino non mundo serviamus ad gloriam Dei, vel ut alii habent libri τῷ καιρῷ, i. e. occasioni serviamus, nullam oportunitatem bene agendi negligentes: sed tempus quantum in nobis est (ut loquitur Apost.) redimentes, ut quasi in procinctu in omnem occasionem intenti, tanquam signo dato tempestive et mature ad nutum Imperatoris nostri gradum conferre, et sacram militiam exercere parati simus, v. 11. Tertius locus in adversis spei solatio et gaudio patientiae invicta virtute et precum assiduitate animos sustentemus, ne ulli fortunae aut homini succumbamus, v. 12. Quartum caput est beneficientiae, cum in sanctos omnes, tum maxime in peregrinos et hospites; nec id solum, sed etiam bene velle et precari infensissimis nobis, et infestissimis hostibus: Christianam συμπάθειαν tam in tristibus, quam in laetis rebus, secundas

res ornando, adversas mitigando studiose, et summa humanitate colamus, v. 13, 14, 15. Quintum, ut sententiarum et opinionum non minus quam animorum et voluntatum summa consensio sit, neque supra captum aut vocationem nostram, quae sunt sublimia ambitiose affectemur, ingenii praefidentia, sed ad ima quaeque atque adeo infima, quoties res et tempus postulant, submissione animi, et modestia vere Christiana nos demittamus; nec nobis nimirum, nostra freti prudentia, aut tribuamus, aut placeamus v. 16. Sextum de injuriis non vindicandis, sed honeste coram omnibus vivendo, et pacem quantum penes nos est, et per officium licet, cum omnibus procurando, etiam de hostibus bene mereamur, vindictam Deo relinquentes, et malum bono superantes v. 20. "Carbones ignis, etc." Proverbialis locutio Prov. cap. xxv. v. 22, i. e. benefaciendo, et tuis in male meritum de te beneficiis hostem in se accendes, ut sibi iratus injuriam tibi factam in se ipse ulciscatur. Atque haec de universali praecepto sanctitatis Ecclesiasticis muneribus, et Ethicis virtutibus accommodato. Sequitur ut politicis et hieraticis accommodetur officiis. *Παραγγέλματα περὶ ἠθικῶν ἀρετῶν ἔστι, περὶτῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους ὁμονοίας καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν λατρείας, καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀντικειμένους ἀνεξικακίας.*

DECIMUM TERTIUM CAPUT.

Περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἄρχοντας ὑποταγῆς,
καὶ περὶ σωφροσύνης, καὶ πραότητος.

De obedientia ergo Magistratus, in quo omne civile officium continetur ex mutua relatione subjectorum erga Magistratum et Magistratus erga subditos, praeceptum hoc politicum initio v. 1. universale, *Πᾶσα ψυχὴ*, neminem hominem cujuscunque ordinis excipiens. Praecipitur *ὑποταγὴ*, subjectio potestatibus *ὑπερεχούσαις*, supereminentibus; in qua voce latet argumentum subjectionis, quod praepositionum *ὑπὲρ* et *ὑπὸ* antithesi arguitur. Si

in superiori gradu constituti sunt, debetur illis ab inferioribus subjectio. Secundum argumentum: A Deo est Magistratus legitimus, quem potestatem vocat ἐξουσίαν, legitimam, non exlegem, aut effrenem licentiam. P. Melanchton: Potestas a personis discernenda; amabat enim Paulus politiam et potestatem; sed Caligulam et Neronem execrabatur, tanquam monstra naturae, organa Diaboli, et pestes humani generis. Tertium argumentum ab ordine divinitus constituto, sub Deo, ad Dei gloriam; ita enim interpretor ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι, non tam a Deo, quod jam dictum fuit, quam sub Deo ordinatas potestates (ὑπὸ γῆς, θεοῖς. [qu. Theocr.] ὑπὸ χθονὸς, Hesiod. ὑπὸ μάλης, sub ala, στέρνοιο, pectore, Hom. Αἴγυπτος δὲ πάλιν ἐγένετο ὑπὸ βασιλέως, sub rege Persarum. Thucyd.) Quas, cum articulo, Τὰς οὔσας ἐξουσίας vocat, quasi dicat, τὰς ὄντως ἐξουσίας, quae reapse potestates sunt, et hoc nomen merentur. Unde impiam et injustam tyrannidem, quae nec a Deo est, quatenus talis, nedum secundum divinum ordinem, excludat ut illegitimam ab hac legitima obedientia, nisi siquando visum Deo, vel suis etiam tyrannum imponere tanquam ferulam paternam ad castigationem, tum profecto et his parendum, siquid neque impium in Deum neque injustum in alios imperant, alioqui defugienda autoritas. Concludit ver. 2, ex secundo et tertio argumento, Deo et divinae ordinationi resistere, qui divinae potestati resistunt, ac proinde ipsos sibi [illegible] cium, i.e., condemnationem et exitium accersere. Quod est quartum argumentum ab effecto inutili, et pernicioso inobedientiae. Ver. 3, rationem reddit, cur et a Deo sint, et ordinatae a Deo potestates, quibus non resistendum, cum quinto obedientiae argumento: Magistratus non sunt timori bonis, sed malis operibus, ergo a Deo et sunt et ordinatae sunt, et illis parendum: Magistratus enim de quibus loquimur, non sunt tyranni importuni, sed benefici et justi principes, apud quos ut malis supplicia, ita bonis praemia sunt constituta; quod probat, ver. 4, quia Dei administer est bono Ecclesiae et bonorum, nec minus vindictae in sceleratos exequendae sumendo supplicio de improbis. Hinc concludit, ver. 5, subjectionis et obedientiae necessitatem duplici de causa, viz., vindictae vitandae, et bonae conscientiae servandae causa, magisque propter conscien-

tiam, quam metu poenae; sub qua et praemium obedienti includitur, ut intelligamus non tam praemium et poenam, quae duo solum urgent Politici, sed multo magis conscientiam, quae Deum sibi testem et vindicem semper habet ob oculos, ad obediendum impellere; imo vero si nulla maneret ultio, tamen quia divinae est ordinationis nostra obedientia, ideo ne tam benignum Patrem offendamus, obstet conscientia oportet. O surdi! O caeci! et plusquam miseri, qui hoc non satis animadvertunt. Parendum ob conscientiam probat a tributis pendendis, quod sextum argumentum est obedientiae a recepta consuetudine, consensu omnium, et jure gentium communi; hujus consuetudinis causam affert longe justissimam quod sint λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ, officiales et administri Dei, publico munere fungentes, non perfunctorie, sed serio et sedulo assiduam operam constanter et patienter navantes bono publico. Observa obiter λειτοῦργον dici hic civilem magistratum, tantum abest ut Missa Pontificia semper λειτουργείας nomine, aut λειτουργούντων functione sit intelligenda. Magna emphasis in participio προσκαρτεροῦντες, quo non tantum aucupio et venatui, Esavi aut Nemrodi instar, quam reipublicae dent operam: Ideo boni principes et legitimi magistratus sunt, de quibus hic agitur et quos depingit graphice Apostolus, et quibus debetur omnis legitima obedientia. Unde concludit, ver. 7, omnia omnibus debita esse praestanda, nec cui quicquam debendum, nisi amorem mutuum et charitatem, vv. 8 et 9, quae est omnium virtutum Christianarum quasi epitome, atque adeo divinae legis, si plena fuerit et perfecta, complementum, ut quae sit nostri in Deum amoris et amoris sancti ἀπόῤῥωξ, rivulus. His positis de omni Politico a Christianis inter se faciendo officio, subjungit abhortationem ver. 10, et stimulos admovet argumento a temporis circumstantia ad omne christianum officium strenue praestandum: imprimis vero ad temperantiam et mansuetudinem colendam. Circumstantia temporis est, instantis dies quasi sub diluculo jam nocte pene transacta, unde opportunitas propinquae lucis praemonet habitum qui luci conveniat assumendum esse, h. e. puritatem et innocentiam. Illustrat hoc temporis argumentum a comparatis; propinquior nunc est salus, quam quando credimus, i.e.,

credere incepimus. Diei nomini videtur significare mane illud, cujus mentio, Psalm xlix., cum pii resurgentes dominabuntur impiis in justorum resurrectione; noctis autem nomine significatur haec vita, quam dum incolimus, multis ignorantiae et calamitatis tenebris circumfusi peregrinamur a Domino; salutis nomine corporum in illustri adventu Christi glorificatio et fruitio gloriae coelestis. Quod si diei hujus propinquitas, progressa multum nocte, Apostoli aetate expergefacere debuit, ad cultum luci congruentem induendum, illius aetatis homines, quanto magis, decurso nunc exinde plus quam mille et quingentorum annorum curriculo, nos somno excuti nunc et ad occurrendum sponso praeparari oporteat, ne cum fatuis virginibus oleo spirituali cassis culpa nostra excludamur. Opera tenebrarum vocat omne genus scelerum et flagitiorum, quorum designandorum praecidendae sunt omnes occasiones. Ideo dicit abjicienda. Induendi verbo perstat in similitudine, quo spectat etiam quod sequitur "Arma lucis," i.e., instrumenta luci congruentia, quibus non solum honeste vestiamur, et ornemur splendide, verum etiam ea praestemus et perficiamus, quae nostri sunt officii. Ideo arma operibus, et lucem tenebris opposuit, ut nos quippe Christiani milites ad conspectum imperatoris non solum in armis conspecti, sed etiam rebus praeclare gestis conspicui appareamus ad gloriae triumphum. Quod dicit tanquam in die, significat nondum exortam esse lucem, aut diem advenisse, ideo addit ὡς, tanquam, ut praeculti praeparemur, quasi antelucanis horis, dum Lucifer exoritur in cordibus nostris prophetico sermone attendendis, ut loquitur Petrus, 2 Ep., cap. i. Εὐσχημόνως decenter, et decenti habitu, indidem sumpta translatione. Intemperantiae duo genera praecavenda monet, quippe gulae et veneris intemperiem. Gulae duas partes notat, commessationem et ebrietatem, sive crapulam et temulentiam. Libidines vero cubilium et proterviarum nomine designat, omne genus obscaenarum voluptatum complexus. Eurip. in priore Autolyco,

γναθοῦ τε δοῦλος, νηδύος θ' ἡσσημένος.
Abdominis minister, et servus gulae.

Ath. 10. De Athletis farciendo solum ventri natis.

Οἱ πρῶτα μὲν ζῆν, οὔτε μανθάνουσιν
Εὖ, οὔτ' ἂν δύναιντο, πῶς γὰρ
Ὅστις ἔς' ἀνὴρ, γναθοῦ τε δοῦλος,
Ἡδυός θ' ἡσσημένος, κτήσαιτ' ἄν
Ὄλβον εἰς ὑπεκτροφὴν πατρῶς. *

Imprimis hi didicere numquam vivere
Recte, nec uniquam illud queant; nam qui potest
Servusque buccae, et impotens abdominis
Spes parare alendo patrio solo.

Quae vitia prohibendo contrarias virtutes imperat; quippe sobrietatem et pudicitiam. Sic vetando contentionem et aemulationem, commendat mansuetudinem atque clementiam, ver. 15. Sed et multo apertius perstans in similitudine et instituta allegoria, dum jubet Dominum Iesum Christum induere; quod notandum, hic de sanctificatione dici ad ornatum sanctimoniae omnis, qua tegatur nostra pudenda nuditas; et multo apertissime, dum vetat carnis providentiam, i.e., curam gerere ad explendas cupiditates, quibus prohibet et gulae et veneris, tum irae tum invidiae omnem intemperiem; ver. 11, καὶ τοῦτο, pendet a verbis ἀπόδοτε, ver. 7, ὀφείλετε, ver 8. Et est idem quod: Idque, respectu oportunitatis et temporis, etc.

CAPUT DECIMUM QUARTUM.

Caput xiv., cum primis 10 et 4 versibus cap. xv., accommodat praeceptum universale de Analogia fidei Hieraticis et Ceremonialibus, praesertim iis, quae, cum lege Mosis constituta essent, Christi beneficio sunt abrogata, et nunc evadunt ἀδιάφορα, quod in se nunc, et natura sua, peccato iis utentem vel abstinentem non implicent;

* [Hos versus, apud Athenaei *Deipnos.* x., p. 413, servatos, sic legi atque disponi jubet cl. Matthiae:

οἱ πρῶτα μὲν ζῆν οὔτε μανθάνουσιν εὖ
οὔτ' ἂν δύναιντο· πῶς γὰρ, ὅστις ἔστ' ἀνὴρ
γναθοῦ τε δοῦλος ἡδυός θ' ἡσσημένος,
κτήσαιτ' ἂν ὄλβον εἰς ὑπερβολὴν πατρός ;]

proinde pro mensura fidei in istis indifferentibus ex charitate versandum. Duo genera selegit pro exemplo, delectum sc. ciborum et dierum. Abstinendum erat ex lege olim cibis quibusdam vetitis, et dies quidam ritu religioso observandi; quod discrimen tam dierum, quam ciborum Lege quidem praeceptum, est antiquatum Evangelio. Proinde cum in Ecclesia Romana fuerint alii firmi, quibus cognitum libertatis Christianae beneficium; alii minus firmi, quibus nondum innotuit ceremoniarum abrogatio, ut quae divinitus olim constitutae et sancitae essent; hi rudiores ex Judaeis, illi firmiores ex Gentibus fideles videntur fuisse. Adhortatur ergo firmiores ex Gentibus ne contemnant ex Judaeis infirmos; et rursus Judaeos infirmos hortatur firmos ex Gentibus ne condemnent. Προσλαμβάνεσθαι est assumere in societatem et communionem vitae, et uti familiariter. Διακρίσεις non tam certamina, quam dijudicationes, et disceptationes significat, quibus scrupulos conscientiis ex ambiguitate et dubitatione injicitur, veluti cum disputando aut altercando quis incertior evadit. Ver. 2, distributio firmorum et infirmorum in fide circa delectum ciborum; 3 vero, quomodo uterque se gerere alter erga alterum debeat praecipitur, ne firmus infirmum contemnat, neve firmum infirmus condemnet. Probat prius membrum: Deus eum assumpsit, Ergo à te quoque assumendus est infirmus, nec contemnendus, quasi res nihili, quod significat verbum ἐξουθενεῖτω, quo factum perstringit eorum, qui fratres infirmiores prae se contemnebant. Verbum προσελάβετο facit hic et ver. 1, ut ad prius membrum referam, ut et participium κρίνων, ver. 4, quem interpretor de posteriore membro ut sit ratio, cur non-edens, sive infirmus edentem seu firmum condemnet; hoc enim est ὁ κρίνων repetitum ex posteriore membro. Damnare hic ergo est tanquam profanum judicare eum, qui ceremonialem legem transgreditur, de sententia infirmi Judaei. Nemo potestatem habet in servum alienum, ut eum damnet; Christianus ex Gentibus est servus alienus, quippe Christi, ergo a te Judaeo non damnandus. Sed quae sequitur ratio, videtur de infirmo dici, propter disjunctionem standi aut cadendi; et correctionem, Stabilietur autem; et rationem correctioni subjectam, Potest, enim, Deus stabilire, viz. eum qui nondum est satis firmus

in fide. Ex hac ambiguitate fit ut distrahatur hic locus ab interpretibus in diversas sententias, dum alii ad prius membrum, alii ad posterius referunt. Ego interea ἐπέχω et amplius pronuntio, ver. 5, alterum exemplum legalis discriminis, quippe delectus dierum. Infirmus Judaeus observat certos dies praescriptos lege; firmus vero ex Gentibus non observat, ut qui nullum statuat in diebus discrimen. Observare est religiosum ducere. Subjungit praeceptum officii ad utrumque spectans; ut quisque sit plene de sua sententia persuasus, i.e. ut firmus ex Evangelio notitiam Christianae libertatis qua sublatum novit dierum discrimen, certa fide apprehendat, ne vacillet ejus conscientia. Sed quomodo tribui potest πληροφορία ignoranti libertatem Christianam. Resp., Si ad infirmum quoque hoc spectat, jubetur legali praecepto inniti, quod novit Dei verbum esse, neque quicquam contra hoc praeceptum Dei dubitante conscientia aggredi, tantisper dum erit plene persuasus de ceremoniarum antiquatione. Sed regeri potest, praeceptum abrogatum nullam amplius vim habet obligandi, nec pro Dei mandato habendum. Respond., Si spectetur in se praeceptum, verum est, neminem eo teneri, verum si spectetur infirmi conscientia, quae neque malitia neque superstitione implicatur, sed praecepti legalis conscientia ducitur, tantisper dum se ignorat hac legi solutum, ad ejus observantiam tenetur: alioqui peccat contra conscientiam. Sequitur argumentum a fine, quem uterque proponit sibi infirmus in observando diem, firmus in negligendo: nimirum gloria Dei; hic utendo libertate per Christum parta ex fidei scientia; ille ritum legalem observando, ex divini praecepti conscientia, non sine fide Deum glorificans. Hunc finem illustrat remotione contrarii finis, sed in genere; ut et assumptione veri finis, tam vitae, quam mortis nostrae. Is autem est, gloria Dei in Christo, cujus nos servi sumus beneficio mortis, et resurrectionis ipsius, ut ille noster Dominus, cui serviendum est nobis. Argumentum autem a genere sumptum est, Nos ubique et semper Christi servi sumus, et ejus gloriam spectare debemus; ergo sive diem observemus, sive negligamus, Dei gloriam in Christo spectare debemus. Notandus hic locus contra profanam philosophiam Aristotelis de felicitate, et ultimo

fine hominis. Melius Stoici; Non nobis solum nati sumus, &c. Et omnia hominis causa generata; hominem vero Dei colendi causa. Nec solum jure creationis, sed multo magis jure redemptionis, quanti quanti sumus mancupio et nexu Dei in Christo obligamur. Ad hunc ergo finem in omni vita, atque adeo in morte collineandum est nobis. Sic erit nobis Christus tum in vita, tum in morte lucrum, ver. 7, 8, 9. Cui vivimus, et morimur, is nobis est Dominus, et ei nos servi sumus; ergo, &c. Deest propositio, sed assumptio cum conclusione plena habetur, v. 8; rationem hujus domini a Christo, ver. 9, ponit. Repetit ver 10, adhortationem bimembrem objurgationis forma; ubi retinet praecepti bimembris verba supra, v. 3. Ne infirmus firmum condemnet, aut firmus infirmum contemnat. Unde adducor ut credam, nos recte v. 4, illud *ὁ κρίνων* ad infirmum retulisse. Ratio utrique membro inserta sub fratris nomine, quod pugnat cum contemptu, aut condemnatione fratres propter mutuam germanitatem, et arctiorem in Christo conjunctionem. Haec ratio fraternitatis adducta est ex ratione parti a Christo in nos dominii, quod nimirum pari opera, et nos sibi in servos, et nos inter nos ut fratres effecit; Si fratres, Ergo non judices ad contemnendum, aut condemnandum; cum judicandi de nobis omnibus potestas omnis sit Christi, quod faciet suo tempore, ut apud Esai, cap. xliv., confirmat ipse jurejurando omnes ad suum tribunal sistendos esse. Unde concludit ver. 12, non fratrem a fratre, sed unumquemque nostrum a Deo judicatum iri. Unde repetit adhortationem, utrumque membrum uno judicandi nomine comprehendens synecdochice, et per *ἀνταναπλάσιν* idem verbum mutata significatione repetit, ut sc. dispiciamus, ne fratrem offendamus; agit autem de scandalo dato, non accepto, ut vulgo dicitur. Vide differentiam inter *προσκόμμα* et *σκάνδαλον*, quod hic vetatur firmus ponere infirmo, v. 13. Sequitur occupatio: Dicat qui firmus est, Nullus cibus est natura sua immundus, cum sit bona Dei creatura, et usui nostro sanctificetur verbo et precibus in Christo. Fateor (inquit Apost.) per se verum esse, sed per accidens propter infirmi fratris conscientiam tibi non licere cum fratribus offensa, cui cibus ille videtur impurus eo cibo uti; hoc enim esset non tam uti, quam abuti, fraternam

charitatem violando, v. 14, 15. Repetit v. 15, conclusionem illustratam novo argumento, eoque efficacissimo, verbis valde signatis, dum hoc vocat perdere fratrem; quem circumscribit periphrasi, vocans eum illum pro quo Christo mortuus est, commissis per contentionem inter se cibo tanquam re vilissima et morte Christi, qua frater redemptus est pretio longe maximo. Ubi et Christi exemplum profertur in contemptores fratrum infirmiorum, pro quibus mortem oppetere non est dedignatus. Indignum facinus pluris aestimare buccellam carnis, quam carnem filii Dei pro nobis crucifixam, et membrum Christi. Rursus infert conclusionem amplificatam altero argumento ab adjunctis, ne male audiat Evangelium, propter abusum Christianae libertatis, v. 16. Ratio subjiciter, v. 17, ab objecto libertatis, et objecti distributione, cum remotione falsi objecti: Libertas nostra Christiana, qua in regno Dei fruimur, non est in cibo et potu, sed in justitia tam justificante nos, quam sanctificante, et in pace cum Deo, et inter nos, qua diremtis inimicitiis, et pacificatione per Christum facta, cum Deo et fratribus in gratiam redivimus, ac denique in guadio, cujus autor in nobis est Spiritus Sanctus, qui certa persuasione divini erga nos amoris, et favoris perpetui facit ut gloriemur sub spe gloriae Dei, atque adeo sub crucis acerbitate, et mediis rerum adversarum fluctibus. Denique in justitiae et pacis studio, et Spiritus consolatione, non in his rebus externis positum est regnum Dei. Potentissimum hoc argumentum et caeterorum omnium fundamentum; quod probat relatorum mutua affectione, et adjunctis. Ubi observa regnum Dei et nostram servitutem, qua Christo servimus, ita affici inter se mutuo, ut nostra Christiana libertas sit Christo servire, et hac servitute nos regni Dei participes esse. In quibus ergo servimus Christo, in iis utimur nostra libertate, vel potius libertas nostra in his posita est, et eorum fruitione, quae nobis acquisivit Christus, quaequae sunt regni Christi privilegia, pro quibus tanquam rebus necessariis est serio contendendum, ut grati deo et accepti, nec invisi hominibus, sed probati simus. De aliis vero rebus ut minime necessariis, nulla contentione est opus. Pacem igitur et conscientiarum tranquillitatem cum mutua fratrum aedificatione secte-

mur, quaeque et hanc et illam promovent, studiose confectemur ver. 19. Novum argumentum cum occupatione ver. 20. Edere cum fratris offendiculo est ejus conscientiam laedere et illi occasionem praebere resiliendi a fide, quae est opus Dei, atque ita fidem cum ipso perdendi. Occupatio est omnia sunt pura. Verum quod per se licitum et purum est, si cum fratris offendiculo fiat, illicitum et impurum evadit ver. 20. Igitur ab eo abstinendum, ver. 21. Prolepsis sive occupatio alia: Tametsi fidem habes, et libertatem Christianam plane cognitam, tamen non est ejusmodi rebus mediis palam cum fratrum offensione utendum; sed potius hic thesaurus apud se recondendus, et clam eo fruendum coram Deo. Atque haec cautio spectat ad firmiores; infirmos vero altera, Ne ambigente conscientia quicquam faciant. Syllogismus integer est inverso partium ordine:—Quicquid fit non ex fide, peccatum est; Esus carnis ambigente conscientia fit non ex fide; Ergo esus carnis ambigente conscientia peccatum est; Et qui sic edit, peccat contra conscientiam, et sic seipsum condemnat. Conclusio ver. 22, primo loco, assumptio secundo, propositio ultimo loco, utraque ver. 23. Illud *δοκιμάζει* in conclusione non significat firmam ex fide et certa notitia approbationem; sed *μετονυμικῶς*, effectum ejus potius, ut probare hic sit amplecti, et facere non secus ac si firma fide approbaret, cum tamen dubitante conscientia id faciat; atque ita damnat seipsum. Quod si beatus est, qui non dubitante conscientia facit id quod facit; certe miser est, qui quicquam dubitans facit, et hoc ipso se damnat. Et observa significationem participii *διακρινόμενος* hoc loco, ut cap. iv. supra de Abrahamo, *οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ*, ad confirmandam nostram interpretationem in v. 1 hujus cap. *εἰς διακρίσεις τῶν διαλογισμῶν*. Significat enim verbum hoc, si vim vocis spectes, judicare, et inter judicandum alternare sententiam, et quasi in diversas sententias judicium distrahere, quod est dubitare et ambigere, ut in locis omnibus. Elegans verborum *παρονομασία*, sed efficacior in rebus emphasis, *διακρινόμενος κατακέκριται*, q. d. qui judicans dubitat, aut dubitans judicat, is procul omni dubio certissime se judicando condemnat.

DECIMUM QUINTUM CAPUT.

Prosequitur exhortationem de tolerandis infirmis, quae videtur eadem reipsa cum ea quae habetur cap. xiv. v. 1, nisi quod illic infirmum fide assumendum, hic infirmorum infirmitates portandas moneat, idque in genere. Quod ita intelligendum, ne putemus ad fratrum vitia connivendum esse, aut fidem charitati posthabendam, sed quod licet per pietatem humanitatis habenda ratio. Removet impedimentum, et fontem aperit morosi et difficilis animi in fratrum infirmitatibus non tolerandis, nimirum φιλαυτίαν, et amorem nostri, quo fit ut nimium nobis ipsis cum fastidio et contemptu fratrum indulgeamus : hoc enim est sibi ipsis placere. Utitur verbo βαστάζειν, portare humeris et bajulare, q. d. Ideo nos robustiores et fide firmiores fecit Dominus, ut apti essemus sublevandis fratrum infirmitatibus : ut quemadmodum legalis pontifex gestabat humeris nomina duodecim tribuum Israelis, Christum pontificem nostrum adumbrans, qui nostras infirmitates in se suscepit bajulans, ita nostrum est officium (quod sine scelere praetermitti non potest) imbecillium fratrum infirmitates gestare. Cujus nostrae tolerantiae finem et fructum definit aedificationem, ne, nimia indulgentia adblandiendo fratribus, eos perdamus; et urget rursus Christi exemplum, qui non solum pro infirmis fratribus, sed etiam hostibus crudelissimis extrema quaeque perpessus est, quod probat Davidis testimonio, qui typum gerens Christi in sua persona Christi perpessiones descripsit, Psal. lxix. Et ne quis objiciat haec de Davide, non de Christo scripta esse, subjungit 4 ver. generalem sententiam de toto veteri Testamento, et omnibus omnium Patrum exemplis; haec ad nos omnia pertinere, ut quae magnum usum praestent augendae spei nostrae et confirmandae, praescriptis patientiae et consolationis documentis. Notetur usus veteris Scripturae, quam late pateat, et quam sit piorum singulis plus quam necessarius ad doctrinam, ad patientiam, ad consolationem, ut in spe salutis adaucti indies magis confirmemur. Adhortationi preces adjungit, ver. 5. pro consensu mutuo, ut tam firmi, quam infirmi in omnibus

idem sentientes in Christo, alii sint aliis ad omnia pietatis humanitatisque officia et incitamento et adjumento, idque Christi exemplo, ver. 6, 7, 8, qui non est dedignatus honore Judaeos, quamvis indignis. minister ipse factus ad praestandam veritatem foederis pacti cum majoribus; aut misericordia Gentes natura a foedere alienas, quarum vocationem quatuor probat ex veteri Scriptura testimoniis. Atque haec ideo, ne Judaei Gentes tanquam profanas, aut Gentes Judaeos tanquam indignos rejiciant aut aspernentur, 9, 10, 11, 12. Denique, ver. 13, obsignat precibus superiorem omnem παράινεσιν, quibus contendit a Deo, ut ipse Romanos gaudio et pace cumulate adaugeat, adauctis earum causis Fide et Spe, idque autore Spiritu Sancto. Et sic concludit omnem tractationem illam superiorem tam doctrinae, quam disciplinae. Ac deinde transit ad ultimam partem hujus Epistolam, Epilogum, sive peroratiouem, in qua et amor Pauli erga Romanos omni ex parte se effundit abundantius, et Apostolica autoritas se magnificentissime effert. Nam ut prooemium erat ἠθικώτερον in tractandis affectibus, ita ἐπίλογός ἐστι παθητικώτερος, et aliquanto vehementior. In prooemio insinuatione, quasi actis cuniculis, et clandestina arte est usus: in ἐπιλόγῳ palam se produnt affectus, quasi aperto Marte ageret; verum utrobique sancto et divino artificio sancte et divinitus utitur. Pro Romanorum bono affectu se duplex hic exerit, alter alteri oppositus, quippe amoris unus, et alter odii: hic in adversarios, ille adversum Romanos et Romanorum studiosos: hos amandos, illos declinandos monet. Amorem erga Romanos suum partim excusatione, partim salutatione commendat. Excusatio duplex, altera scriptionis liberioris, altera dilati adventus. Salutatio item duplex, altera quasi religiosior per faustam imprecationem, altera quasi humanior, sed religioni perfusa, tum a se tum ab aliis. Redeamus ad excusationem, et primum scriptionis, quam affert diversorum argumento, et figurat prolepsi sive occupatione: Quamvis abundetis omnibus bonis spiritualibus, tamen ad vos scripsi liberius. Rationem libertatis reddit Apostolici sibi impositi muneris necessitatem, cujus efficaciam praedicat ab effectis magnificentissime. Commendatio Romanorum tribus partibus constat,

bonitate, cognitione, et commonefaciendi facultate, quae tres quasi laudum partes mirifice amplificantur ab adjuncta copia seu plenitudine, et Apostoli ipsius certa persuasione. Ἀγαθωσύνη sive bonitatis abundantia videtur respicere mansuetudinem, et tolerantiam in ferendis fratrum infirmitatibus quod argumentum proxime tractavit; γνώσεως plenitudo sive opulentia doctrinam justificationis et salutis atque adeo praedestinationis ad 12. usque caput disputaram; νουθεσία, i. e. commonefactio, vel utramque vel saltem παραινέσεις ad omnem Christianam virtutem. [Expende hoc diligentius.] Ergo quamquam nihil vobis desit, tamen sum audaculus in scribendo, etc.

Primum dicit τολμηρότερον, quasi paulo audacior; deinde extenuat audaciam ἀπὸ μέρους; neque enim debet hoc conjungi cum verbo ἔγραψα, ut faciunt Pseudo-romanenses ad minuendam Scripturae plenitudinem. Tertio addit ut commonefaciens, non docendi vos, sed refricandae memoriae vestrae causa: Quarto, gratiam divinitus sibi datam cum autoritate Apostolica adducit, cujus autorem Deum in Christo per Spiritum Sanctum agnoscit, idque bono et saluti Gentium, ac proinde sanctificationi Romanorum, quorum se Apostolus est professus initio Epistolae; ἱερουργοῦντα, sancte praedicantem. Perpetua translatio a legalibus sacerdotiis; ἱερουργεῖν est sacris operari, rem divinam facere, rem sanctam sancte administrare, ut hoc loco tribuitur Apostolo sacrosanctum Evangelium sancte administranti ad Gentes sanctificandas in sanctam oblationem et acceptam Deo per Spiritum Sanctum. Ideo et se λειτουργον vocavit publicum sacrorum administrum; cujusmodi haud scio an veteres Romani Camillum, aut Casmillum, aut quo alio nomine appellarint; Vide Festum, Varronem, Isiodorum, Glossarium vetus, alios. Hinc infert ver. 17. se amplam habere materiam gloriandi sibi divinitus in Christo praelitam de effectis Apostolatus sui, unde colligant Romani et hanc Epistolam apud illos efficacem fore, suum vero adventum, cum Deus voluerit, longe efficacissimum. Efficaciam ergo Apostolatus sui amplificat mirifice ab effectis omnium generum admirandis, quorum gloriam tribuit Deo, illorum omnium per Spiritum Sanctum autori et effectori, tam verborum quam factorum

administratione: amplificat et a locis subjectis, et regionum amplitudine, quas repleverit Evangelii praedicatione, quod in iis ante fuit inauditum, secundum Esaiae praedictionem. Notanda et haec quoque nota Apostolatus, positio fundamenti, ut de seipso loquitur, 1 Cor. cap. iii. "Peritus architectus fundamentum posui." Et coelestis Hierosolymae duodecim fundamentis nomina xii. Apostolorum agni inscripta; Apoc. xxi. Notetur et verbum φιλοτιμούμενον, cui subest ambitionis notio, q. d. se ambitiose studiosum fuisse ad sanctam suam cupiditatem explendam. Atque hanc causam impedimento fuisse docet saepenumero, quo minus eos inviserit, vide supra, cap. i. v. 13. Ἐκωλύθη, etc. Nec dubium quin Spiritu Sancto autore detentus, et occupatus in his tractibus praedicatione Evangelii ad fundandas primum Ecclesias, vide Act xvi., ver. 19. Sic transit ad alteram excusationem dilati adventus sui (vel potius infert ex superiori,) cujus ipse multis jam annis flagravit desiderio, et nunc brevi futurum pollicetur, sublato illo, (cujus meminit,) impedimento. Climata nominat numero multitudinis verbo geographico usus, ut quam longe lateque per orbem terrarum Evangelium disseminarit intelligatur, et converso ad Christum oriente sibi in animo et occidentem invisere, imprimis utramque Hesperiam, i. e., Italiam et Hispaniam, quam Σπανίων, sicuti et Gellius, lib. ix. cap. xiii., Gladium Spanicum, dixit; verum nunc non posse profectionem ad illos adornare propter Eleemosynam a Macedonicis et Achaicis Ecclesiis collatam, et pauperibus Hierosolymitanis sua opera nunc conferendam. Causam affert hujus erogationis, sive τῆς λογίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, (ut 1 Cor. cap. xvi. ver. 1, loquitur,) expromptam et voluntariam conferentium oblationem, et debitum fratribus Judaeis officium, imparium argumento illustratum; ut Romanos illorum exemplo provocet ad sanctam et piam aemulationem. Hoc igitur perfecto καὶ σφραγισάμενος, i.e., fideliter et quasi annulo obsignatum deposuero fructum hunc charitatis Gentium erga Judaicas Ecclesias, abibo per vos in Hispaniam. In Hispaniam venisse non legimus, neque est verisimile ex historia Actorum; sed Romam venit interposita ad Caesarem provocatione, adeo ut distinguenda sint ea, quae de humano affectu ex sinceritate

animi scripserunt Apostoli, ab iis quae ex Dei consilio de divinis mysteriis, autore Spiritu Sancto, literis prodiderunt. Vide Junii Theologiam sub finem. Sed neque Apostolus hoc loco pro certo affirmat se venturum, cum illud Jacobi, ἐὰν ὁ θεὸς θελήσῃ, sancto Apostoli animo semper insederit, nec citra hanc conditionem quicquam in hoc genere pollicitus sit. Quod vero dicit οἶδα, certe scio ver. 29, non ad certitudinem suae in Hispaniam profectionis, aut adventus, verum ad donorum et benedictionum Spiritualium abundantiam et fructum, quem, cum Romam venerit, secum sit approbaturus: Tum enim fore certo sibi persuadet, ut Deus ipsi cumulatissime impertiat Evangelicorum mysteriorum cognitionem cum illis communicandam. Quid si ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας pro εἰσ πλήρωμα, i.e., in eum locum, ubi plene abundat Evangelii gratia, q.d. Apostolus, se non dubitare quin apud eos copiosissimum Evangelii fructum sit inventurus. Nota item λειτουργῆσαι verbum, ver. 27, de erogandis in usum pauperum facultatibus et conferendis Eleemosynis dici, ne ex hoc charitatis officio Romanenses missae fabricent sacrificium. In hunc etiam finem postulat eorum preces, quibus adjutus possit omnes difficultates superare, ne in itinere ad Romanos suscipiendo retardetur, vv. 30, 31, 32. Ubi gravi obtestatione utitur per Dominum Iesum Christum, per amorem Spiritus, i.e., mutuam illam animorum conjunctionem, cujus autor est Spiritus Sanctus. Notandum etiam verbum συναγωνίζεσθαι, quod est certatim et summa contentione comprecari, ut sciamus neque trepidas, neque perfunctorias preces esse debere. Tandem concludit hanc alteram excusationem precibus. Ubi nota ver. 5 supra, Deum patientiae et consolationis, 13, Deum Spei, nunc vero 33, hoc ver. Deum pacis *sub.* autorem et largitorem appellari, et in his omnibus locis accommodari diversam appellationem Dei ad ipsarum precum, pro earum diversitate, argumentum, ut non temere ullo in loco vel nominetur Deus, vel diversimode appelletur: Sapientissime enim et appositissime ad argumenti naturam quod tractatur divinitus nomina divina accommodantur.

DECIMUM SEXTUM CAPUT.

Ventum ad alteram partem perorationis, quae in salutationibus posita est, quam incipit a commendatione Phaebes cujusdam, [quae erat] Cenchraeensis Ecclesiae ministra, seu diaconissa (ut loquuntur veteres canones,) una ex viduis sexagenariis, quae ministrabant pauperibus, aegris, exulibus, peregrinis, de quarum collegio 1 Timoth. v. Προΐστατιν, q.d. προϊσταμένην τῶν ξενῶν, quod praeesset, et curam gereret hospitum et peregrinorum, quos in domum suam atque adeo fidem receperit, quod ejus domus, velut publicae sanctorum hospitis, fratribus peregrinis patuerit, et ut loquitur Apost. 1 Tim. v., fuit hospitalis, sanctorum pedes lavit, subvenit afflictis, etc. Observa composita ejusdem verbi in paronomasia, Συνίστημι, παραστῆτε, προστατις. Sed multo magis illud ἐν κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, i.e., Christi nomine, in gratiam Christi, aut propter Christum: hoc enim proprium est Christianae charitatis, quum alioqui profani homines humanitatis interdum et hospitalitatis funguntur in speciem officiis. Quod sequitur ad verbum "digne sanctis," ambiguum activene (ut loquuntur) an passive, ut convenit Romanis quippe sanctis excipere sanctos, an ut convenit sanctis excipi hospitio et tractari ut dignum est Phaeba, quae sancta est soror, an ut dignum est vobis sanctis fratribus. Quid si utrumque? Priscillam et Aquilam tribus argumentis commendat, quod σύνεργοι ἐν χριστῷ, quod pro vita Pauli corpora sua abjecerint, quod hoc nomine de omnibus Ecclesiis Gentium bene promeriti sint. Observa illorum domum Ecclesiam appellari. Tertia salutatio Epaeneti, quod sibi charus, quod primitiae Achaiae, vel potius Asiae, ut habent exemplaria, quod primus ex Achaeis se Christo consecrasset Evangelium amplexus: Metaphora a legalibus ceremoniis. Andronicum et Juniam vocat insignes inter Apostolos, non quia Apostoli fuisse videantur, nisi valde universali significatione, sed quod nomen eorum apud ipsos etiam Apostolos celebre esset. Dicuntur fuisse in Christo, i.e. Christo insiti, et vere Christiani. Si Junia mulieris nomen, Apostolus dici non potuit. Quas mulieres nominat, Mariam, Tryphae-

nam, Tryphosan, Persida, etc., quibus tribuit multum laborem in Domino, intellige de ministerio et hospitalitate erga sanctos, ut dictum est de Phaebe, ver. 1. Herman autorem libri Apocryphi Pastoris nomine tradunt veteres, quem librum lego, sed cum judicio; est enim suspectae fidei. Φλέγοντα, fortasse cujus meminit Eusebius inter Chronologos. Ver. 16, Sanctum osculum vocat amoris sancti indicem, qui ex animo sanctae charitatis pleno proficiscitur, ex more illorum temporum et regionum, ut testantur tam sanctae quam profanae literae. Salutant vos ecclesiae Christi: Videntur haec verba 21 versum inchoare debere, ut habet Claromontanus codex, et ut subjectae aliorum salutationes innuunt. Mirum nullam hic fieri Petri mentionem, si Romae fuerit hoc tempore, ut veteres plerique tradiderunt, et Romani pro articulo fidei tenent, et ferro flammisque defendunt. Inserta est cautio de vitandis ἑτεροδιδασκάλοις, quos dissidiorum et scandalorum autores vocat, q. d. uti vobis hactenus bonos commendavi, ita hortor ut sollicite et attente observetis, quasi e specula callidos impostores; hoc enim est σκοπεῖν, unde scopulus; παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν, praeterita doctrina, potius quam contra doctrinam, qui sc. aliud docebant, aut aliter quam dedicissent Romani, aut docerent Apostoli. Ἐκκλίνατε ἀπ' αὐτῶν, notanda vis praepositionum, ἐκ et ἀπὸ, ut significetur separatio ab iis, et eorum excommunicatio, ut prioris ad Tim. cap. vi. v. 5, ἀφίστασο, secede. Ita Paulus Act. xix., secessit a Judaeis contumacibus, et separavit discipulos. Descriptio eorum sumpta est ab effectis et adjunctis admodum accurata, adeo ut quamvis eos non nominet, tamen ita graphice depingat, ut ab omnibus agnosci possint. Negat Christo servire, sed ventri, quod hujus vitae commodis et honoribus inhient. Ἐξαπατῶσι, seducunt, signatum verbum, quo imposturae efficacis effectus exprimitur; est enim extra rectam viam abducere, ab ἐξ et ἀπάτη, seductio, ab a privandi particula, et πάτος, vestigium, aut via trita, πάτον ἄνθρωπον ἀλεσίνει. Duas tribuit illis quasi machinas, quibus incautos et minime malos in fraudem inducant, χρηστολογίαν et εὐλογίαν, quarum altera summam humanitatis, altera pietatis prae se speciem fert. Nam χρηστολογία, qua rationis blanditias, seu blandiloquentiam significat, cujusmodi

est eorum, qui multum pollicentur, parum aut nihil praestant; qui de aliorum magis, quam suis commodis videri volunt solliciti; reapse tamen blandiores, quam benigniores, ut de Pertinace Imperatore Aurelius Victor. De quibus vulgatus iste versiculus, Catoni inscriptus:

> Noli homines blandos nimium sermone probare,
> Fistula dulce canit, volucrem dum decipit auceps.

Εὐλογία dicitur a profanis quidem scriptoribus oratio ad aliorum laudes praedicandas accommodata, a verbo εὐλογεῖν, vel de fucata et inani facundia; Εὔλογος αἰτία de causa probabili aut verisimili; et fortasse εὐλογία significat speciem rationis et probabilitatis, ut πιθανολογία alibi apud Apostolum in vitio ponitur. Verum ex usu Scripturae, et hujus Apostoli acceperim de benedictione, vel de fausta precatione, quod his artibus soleant uti Pseudoprophetae, ut pietatis obtentu fallant. Utitur autem verbo παρακαλεῖν, quo serio se agere significat, non quod de eorum fide, aut obedientia dubitet, quae toti fere terrarum orbi innotuerit, quae et Apostolo magnam spiritualis gaudii materiam subministret; verum quia ea est veteratorum fraus et versutia, ut quae facile clandestinis artibus et calliditate, ut est Eph. c. iv. v. 14, minus circumspectis imponat. Ideo ait se requirere, ut non solum sint simplices, ἀκέραιοι, qui nullam prorsus nocendi artem teneant, nedum ut reapse nocere studeant; sed etiam ut cognitione veritatis, et prudentia instructi, σοφοὶ, bona amplecti, mala vitare, fraudes et laqueos pseudo-apostolorum effugere, illis aperte possint obsistere. Sic Christus monet discipulos suos, ut serpentes prudentia, simplicitate columbas imitentur. Cautio his temporibus apprime necessaria. Et ne despondeant animos ob veteratoriam impostorum versutiam, aut hominum gratiam, aut potentiam, spondet victoriam brevi de ipsorum Imperatore (si veterem interpretem Latinum et Syrum sequamur, qui συντρίψῃ legunt), et fraudis ac mendacii parente, Diabolo, cum omni ejus falsorum doctorum satellitio, pacis nostrae autore Deo in Christo: Verum ita, ut nolit nos securos esse, sed dum praeit ipse precibus, ut supra saepius, sic etiam nunc repetitis, gratiae Dei in

Christo Romanos commendans, tam nos, quam illos suo exemplo docet hoc genus daemoniorum (ut Christus ait) nonnisi jejunio et precibus profligari: Et solam Dei gratiam in Christo felicem nobis exitum e tantis difficultatibus largiri posse. Atque haec de cautione, cui subjicienda (ut dixi) generalis omnium Ecclesiarum salutatio, et nominatim quarumdam illustrium personarum, cum ad fovendam animorum conjunctionem mutuam, tum ad obsignandam tot quasi subscriptionibus superioris doctrinae veritatem, v. 2. Tertius, Apostoli amanuensis, qui sive dictante Apostolo scripserit, sive ex ejus ὑπογραφῇ, adversariis, descripserit hanc Epistolam, suam quoque salutationem adscribit ἐν κυρίῳ, quae verba referri etiam possunt ad scriptionis verbum, q. d. se hanc operam Apostolo non solum propter Dominum accommodasse, sed etiam ἐν κυρίῳ h. e. sincere et fide optima et Christi Spiritus ope. Sequitur Caius hospitalitatis nomine commendatissimus, sive Derbaus Pauli comes, Act. cap. xx. v. 4, sive Macedo, Act. cap. xix. v. 29, sive Corinthius quem Paulus ipse baptizavit, 1 Cor. cap. i.; quod postremum est maxime probabile, nec non Corinthi scriptam hanc Epistolam, 2 Cor. cap. xii. v. 14, et Act. 20. Atque hanc etiam Corinthum, sequenti versu urbis nomine appellatam intelligo: cujus oeconomus, i. e. vel curator vel procurator, si minus quaestor, nominatur Erastus. Denique, v. 24, jam tertio illis valedicit cum precibus; ac postremo gratiarum actione Epistolam claudit, quae clausula in quibusdam codicibus cap. 14, fini attexitur. Sensus est, Deo sit gratia per Iesum Christum. Rationes sunt, quia solus potest confirmare in nobis, quam dedit, fidei obedientiam, quia solus revelavit nobis illud Evangelium mysterium, quod a temporibus aeternis tacitum fuit, quod obscurius in veteri Testamento, in Novo reddidit illustrius, quia solus sapiens, etc. Ubi doctrinam fidei vocat Evangelium suum, et praedicationem Christi revelationem mysterii ab aeterno taciti: hujusque revelationis gradum duplicem, obscuriorem per prophetas, illustriorem per Christum et Apostolos, eamque ex imperio ipsius Dei, ad efficacem Gentium vocationem.

Τέλος.

ΙΓΝΑΤΙΟΥ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους [§ 14].

Ἀρχὴ ζωῆς πίστις, τέλος ἀγάπη· τὰ δὲ δύο ἐν ἑνότητι γενόμενα θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἀποτελεῖ· τὰ δὲ ἄλλα πάντα εἰς καλοκαγαθίαν ἀκόλουθά ἐστι.

Scaliger. Poetices, lib. 6, cap. 4, fo. 790.

Selecta esse oportet, quae proponas tanto theatro, quantus est ambitus universae linguae Latinae, tractus aetatis orbis universae. Divitiae non in copia, sed in electis opibus consistunt.

Ad. D. Andream Melvinum.

Defessus veluti patula requiescit in herba,
Assidet inventis ut sitibundus aquis,
Thesauro veluti effosso sub vomere fossor
Abjecto ad loculos sponte ligone sedet:
Sic cupida et defessa diu sitibundaque nobis
Melvine exprompto nectare corda reples.
Et recreas animum *vino*, et coelestia dona
Aerei *mellis* suppeditare soles.

Finis:

Quem imposuit Daniel Demetrius, octo dierum spatio, exemplar Andr. Melvini secutus, Andreapoli in Scotia, Anno 1601, 26. Julii.

ERRATA.

N.B.—The first twelve chapters of Ferme's commentary having been printed, without being submitted to the Translator for correction while passing through the press, he regrets to find that several verbal inaccuracies, and numerous mistakes in the punctuation, division of sentences, and marks of quotation, have escaped notice.—The errors of the latter description particularly affect the syllogisms and enthymemes; which, being stated in due form by the *author*, should have been uniformly divided and pointed in the regular way, as has been done in the last four chapters. Had this been attended to, as was the intention of the Translator, it would both have been more in keeping with the character of the treatise itself, and, at least, have somewhat lightened the labour of the reader.

Of these, those only which *materially* affect the sense are noticed below, along with such verbal errors as have been detected, after a careful revision.

Page 2, l. 15, for *His* read *this*; p. 4. l. 3 from bottom, read *to God.* "*For*, &c.
p. 5, l. 18, after *immediately* insert *after*; l. 20, after *to be* a break instead of a semicolon.
p. 6, l. 5, after *them* a break instead of a period; line 8 from bottom, for *proximate* read *last*. p. 8, l. 8, include the word *gospel* in brackets.
p. 9, l. 14, instead of a break put a period after *only*.
p. 11, l. 9, for *faith in* read *faith of*; l. 12, for *of faith* read *from faith*; l. 4 from bottom, for *of the faith* read *from the faith*.
p. 12, l. 10, for *by faith* read *from faith*; l. 9 from bott. for *profession* read *proposition*.
p. 13, l. 7 from bottom, after *transition* insert a comma; l. 11, put a period after '*verse*.'
p. 15, l. 2, put a period after *himself*; l. 20, for *this* read *that*.
p. 16, l. 6, for *has* read *had*.
p. 17, l. 3 from bottom, the asterisk should be after *unnatural* in the line preceding.
p. 18, l. 4 from bottom, after *held it* insert *in*; last line, for *of the* read *of this*.
p. 19, l. 1, for 1 *Cor.* xi. 8, read 1 *Cor.* ii. 8.; l. 10, for *effecting* read *effect in*; l. 11, after *holy* put a break for the period; l. 2 from bottom, put a period instead of a comma after *conclusion*.
p. 20, l. 11, for *is given* read *are given*. p. 21, l. 10, dele the stops; l. 18, dele *thou*.
p. 22, l. 4, for *conduct* read *effect* [*or conduct.*]
p. 24, l. 20, after *said* put a period for the comma.
p. 27, l. 9 from bottom, after *Gentiles* put a period for the colon.
p. 29, l. 6, for *Jew* read *Jews*; l. 8, for *possess* read *possessed*; l. 19, for *god* read *gods*; l. 25, after *ideas* insert *of it*.

p. 30, l. 3, after *knowledge* insert *and boasting of being a teacher of others;* l. 10, dele the comma after *abhor.* p. 31, l. 2, for *Isaiah* iii. 5, read *Isaiah* lii. 5.

p. 32, l. 13, after *law* put a comma for the period.

p. 33, l. 4, *and* should begin a new sentence.

p. 35, l. 20, insert a comma after *believe;* footnote, for *premise* read *premiss.*

p. 37, l. 4, dele the period after *abhorrence.*

p. 38, l. 4, after *Jews* insert (v. 3); l. 13, instead of *For* read *In;* l. 15, instead of *arresting* read *wresting;* l. 17, for *laws* read *law;* l. 23, read *ourselves, we "in no way,"* &c.; ll. 28, 29, the marks of quotation are omitted.

p. 39, add as a footnote—*Conjugates;* i. e. *cognate terms.*

p. 42, l. 9, from bottom, read "*through Jesus Christ.*"

p. 43, l. 5 from bottom, after *classes,* insert *who believe.*

p. 45, l. 8, for *the* read *his,* and for *his* read *the;* l. 15, read *for "to be past";* footnote, read Ἐνσάρκωσιν. p. 47, l. 12 from bottom, instead of *(for us)* read [*for us*].

p. 49, l. 2, read "*from faith,*" "*through faith.*"

p. 56, l. 5, for *is a contrast* read *in a contrast;* l. 15, insert a comma after the word *circumcision;* insert after the last line, the first line on p. 59.

p. 61, l. 8, insert a comma after *believed.*

p. 63, l. 6, for πτηροφορηθείς. read πληροφορηθείς; l. 14 from bottom, a new paragraph should commence after *righteousness;* l. 2 from bottom, put a period after *us* instead of a comma; last line, commence a new sentence.

p. 64, l. 13, insert a comma at the end of the line, and the words *and that he is.*

p. 65, l. 13, dele the first *had;* l. 20, for *operation* read *effect* [*or operation*]; foot note, for Λόυτρον read Λόυτρον.

p. 67, l. 1, dele *only.*

p. 69, l. 4, put a period after *sufferings;* l. 15, for *affliction* read *tribulation.*

p. 70, l. 19, for *understood* read *understand.* p. 74, l. 11 from bottom, for *was* read *new.*

p. 76, l. 14, for *was* read *would be;* l. 15, for *died* read *would die.*

p. 77, ll. 2, 3, read *infants, who cannot sin actually,* &c.; l. 20, insert double commas after *and,* and a single inverted comma before *that.*

p. 84, l. 3, for *That is,* read *that is.*

p. 86, l. 3, only the word *walk* should be included within the marks of quotation.

p. 87, l. 13, for "*body of death*" read "*body of sin.*" p. 88, l. 15, for *this* read *thus.*

p. 94, l. 6, the line should close with a comma only; l. 7, include the words *for holiness is glory begun,* in brackets. p. 96, l. 1, for *uttered* read *altered.*

p. 97, l. 20, the expression *sinful sin,* which also occurs p. 99, line 6 from bottom; p. 101, l. 1; p. 103, ll. 5 and 7; p. 111, l. 17; and p. 112, l. 2, might, perhaps, have been better rendered *sin-producing sin.*

p. 98, l. 11, insert a comma after *things.* p. 101, l. 16, for *sins work* read *sin works.*

p. 102, l. 3, for *Is then* read *Therefore,* and dele the mark of interrogation; l. 13 from bottom, for *Is then* read *Therefore;* l. 15, remove the mark of interrogation.

p. 104, l. 3, for *work* read *works.* p. 106, l. 15, for *case* read *cause.*

p. 108, l. 8 from bottom, read c. vi. *vv.* 12 and 14; l. 7 from bottom, for *and he* read *or he.*

p. 111, l. 14, for *removed* read *renewed;* l. 20, a new sentence should commence with *for.*

p. 113, ll. 15, 16, for *acting* read *effect* [*or acting*].

p. 117, l. 7 from bottom, insert a comma after the words *and for sin.*

p. 122, l. 14, for *man* read *men.*

p. 123, last line, place a comma after *assumption;* and p. 124, l. 1, after *Spirit.*

p. 128, l. 8 from bottom, for *supposed* read *suppressed.*

p. 133, l. 22, for *Ps.* lxii. 10, read *Ps.* lxii. 10 (9).

p. 137, ll. 9, 10 from bottom, the *inverted commas should be single.*

p. 139, l. 4 from bottom, insert a semicolon before *thus*.

p. 142, l. 5, after *foreknows* insert *us;* l. 6, include *23th* within brackets.

p. 148, l. 10, for *adjunct* read *adjuncts*.

p. 152, l. 11, for *general* read *genera* in italics; l. 20, read *genera* in italics.

p. 157, l. 14, for *after* read *often*. p. 159, l. 8 from bottom, read *glory*—"*for ever;*"

p. 167, l. 6 from bottom, the point after *works* should be a semicolon.

p. 171, l. 10 from bottom, for *things* read *thing;* l. 6 from bottom, for *man* read *may;* l. 4 from bottom, read '*Much more*, &c.

p. 172, l. 14, for *a mere man* read *a mean man*.

p. 176, l. 15, after *predestinated* the point should be a period simply, with a single inverted comma; l. 16, the sentence here commencing should be in the same paragraph with the preceding, and without inverted commas.

p. 177, l. 7 from bottom, the point after *apostle* should be after the word *here*.

p. 178, l. 15, for *in Christ* read *on Christ*.

p. 179, l. 12 from bottom, insert a comma after *conclusion*.

p. 181, l. 15, for *Matt.* xxv. 42, read *Matt.* xxi. 42.

p. 182, l. 1, place a comma after *faith*. p. 183, l. 13, for *in* read *on*.

p. 185, l. 7 from bottom, for *verse* 13 read *verse* 14.

p. 189, l. 8 from bottom, for *as* read *so*.

p. 194, ll. 6 and 7, instead of parentheses put brackets.

p. 195, l. 3 from bottom, for *Greek* read *Greeks*.

p. 202, l. 2, for *contradictive* read *contradicting*. p. 204, l. 2 from bottom, for *by* read *of*.

p. 205, last line, *According* should begin a new sentence.

p. 208, l. 8 from bottom, after *that* insert *which*.

p. 211, l. 12 from bottom, after *judgment*, insert the words *but their judgment*.

p. 212, l. 3 from bottom, a new sentence should commence at *but*.

p. 213, the same sentence should run on as far as the 10th line.

p. 214, last line, after *them* put a semicolon for the period.

p. 215, l. 3, for *Jude* iv. read *Jude* 4.

p. 216, l. 7, put a mark of interrogation after *stumbled;* l. 9 from bottom, after *verse* the point should be a period; l. 5 from bottom, the asterisk should be after the word *recompense* in this line, instead of the line following, and for *and* read *or*.

p. 217, l. 7, after *salvation* there should be simply a comma.

p. 219, l. 14, for *1st Eph.* ii. 9, read *1st Epist.* ii. 9.

p. 222, l. 5 from bottom, for *bear* read *bare*.

p. 224, l. 17, put a period after *quoted;* l. 22, after *or* insert *one*.

p. 228, l. 10, for *Jews* read *Israelites*.

p. 229, insert as a footnote, (to l. 11,) *subalternates, i.e., things opposed to each other, as universal and particular*.

p. 234, l. 7, after *make* insert *up*. p. 239, l. 14, for *To have* read *So have*.

p. 240, l. 2 from bottom, at the end, insert *in so far as it is sin*.

p. 241, foot note, read *Epiphonema, a sentence*, &c.

p. 243, l. 15 from bottom, read *but dispenses reward or punishment, as the case may demand, to him who has previously deserved;*

p. 246, l. 20, after *can live*, insert *to God, or lead*.

p. 247, l. 15 from bottom, read '*the very tender affections, as it were, of*, &c.

p. 249, l. 15, for *subjugated* read *subjected;* l. 17, read "*Living.*" *This is*, &c.; l. 2 from bottom, read *redemption, by death;*

p. 250, l. 13, the words *of that person or thing* should be within parentheses.

p. 257, l. 18, for 1 *Tim.* ii. 8, read 1 *Tim.* ii. 3.

p. 259, l. 13, place a period after *wisdom* and insert *He;* l. 6 from bottom, remove the brackets and read *as a weak brother, namely lest he*, &c.

p. 260, l. 3 from bottom, for *is* read *as*. p. 261, l. 17, for *here* read *there*.
p. 262, ll. 5 and 15, for ὑπερ φρονῶν read ὑπερφρονῶν (in one word.)
p. 264, l. 5, after *he lays* insert *down*; l. 3 from bottom, for *member* read *members*.
p. 265, l. 5 from bottom, after *testifies* insert (1 *Cor.* xii. 7.)
p. 266, l. 16 from bottom should end with a period.
p. 267, l. 2, for *Eph.* vi. 11 read *Eph.* iv. 11.
p. 268, l. 17, for *words* read *word*; l. 2 from bottom, at the beginning insert *the*.
p. 273, l. 9 from bottom, remove the asterisk from this line to the word *just* in l. 4 from the bottom.
p. 282, l. 10 from bottom, and l. 5 ditto, insert commas after *relation* and *respect*.
p. 294, l. 6, for *his* read *their*.

ALEX. WALKER, PRINTER, 6. JAMES's COURT, EDINBURGH.

00111580

V

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 27 February, 2016